Indiana Election Commission Minutes August 1, 2008

Members Present: Thomas E. Wheeler, II, Chairman of the Indiana Election Commission ("Commission"); S. Anthony Long, Vice Chairman of the Commission; Daniel A. Dumezich, Commission member; Sarah Steele Riordan, Commission member.

Members Absent: None.

Staff Attending: J. Bradley King, Co-Director, Indiana Election Division of the Office of the Indiana Secretary of State (Election Division); Pamela Potesta, Co-Director of the Election Division; Leslie Barnes, Co-General Counsel of the Election Division; Dale Simmons, Co-General Counsel of the Election Division; Michelle Thompson, Campaign Finance staff, Election Division.

Also Attending: Anthony (Ty) Bibbs; David Buskill; Martha Carmichael; Rebecca Crumes; Chad Duran, Office of the Attorney General; Michael Gillenwater; Barbara Hutton; Nancy Kraft; Charles Mitchell; Daniel Moore; David Mosley; The Honorable Abraham Navarro, Judge of the Clark County Circuit Court; Rodney Pate; John Vissing; Larry Wilder; Doris Wilkerson.

1. Call to Order

The Chair called the August 1, 2008 meeting of the Commission to order at 10:00 a.m. in the Indiana Government Center South Conference Center Rooms 1 and 2, 402 West Washington Street, Indianapolis, Indiana.

The Chair noted that proper notice of the meeting had been given, as required by state law. A copy of the meeting notice, agenda, and designations of proxy are incorporated by reference in these minutes. [Copies of all documents incorporated by reference are available for public inspection and copying at the Election Division Office.]

2. Transaction of Business

The Commission transacted the business set forth in the Transcript of Proceedings prepared by Rhonda J. Hobbs of Connor Reporting. A copy of this document is incorporated by reference in these minutes.

The following corrections of scrivener's errors in this document are approved by the Commission:

Page 6, line 3, replace "welcomed" with "welcome".

Page 9, line 7, replace "Debold (Phonetic)" with "Diebold".

Page 35, line 4, replace "king" with "King".

Page 39, line 17, replace "Democrat" with "Democrats".

Page 43, line 11, replace "3-6-4.23" with "3-6-4.2-3".

Page 46, line 9, delete "came".

Page 56, line 11, replace "3-13-1.6" with "3-13-1-6".

Page 56, line 12, replace "3-13-1.6" with "3-13-1-6".

Page 67, line 13, replace "115(d)" with "15(d)".

Page 74, line 4, replace "suth sayer" with "soothsayer".

Page 75, line 3, replace "3-13-16 as applying 3-13-19" with "3-13-1-6 as applying 3-13-1-9".

Page 78, line 12, replace "6-8-2—6-8-2" with "6(a)(2)".

Page 87, line 11, replace "error" with "err".

Page 88, line 18, replace "judge in" with "judge and in".

Page 90, line 9, replace "within" with "with".

Page 100, line 12, replace "American" with "America".

Page 106, line 1, replace "Simmons" with "Simmons's".

Page 106, line 19, replace "can't" with "can".

Page 106, line 25, replace "dismisses" with "dismiss".

Page 116, line 9, replace "should ES&S" with "should contact ES&S".

Beginning on page 121, line 11, replace all references in the document to "J. WILKERSON" with "D. WILKERSON".

Page 126, line 4, replace "permeations" with "permutations".

3. Adjournment

There being no further items on the Commission's agenda, the Chair entertained a motion to adjourn. Ms. Riordan moved, seconded by Mr. Dumezich, that the Commission do now adjourn. The Chair called the question, and declared that with four members voting "aye" (Mr. Wheeler, Mr. Long, Mr. Dumezich, and Ms. Riordan), and no Commission member voting "no," the motion was adopted. The Commission then adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Trent Deckard

Co-Director

J. Bradley King Co-Director

APPROVED:

Daniel A. Dumezich

Chairman

ORIGINAL

1	
2	INDIANA ELECTION COMMISSION PUBLIC SESSION NOTICE
3	FORTIC DESSION NOTICE
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	Taken On: Friday, August, 1, 2008
9	
10	At: Indiana Government Center South Conference Rooms 1 and 2
11	402 West Washington Street Conference Room 20
12	Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
13	
14	
15	A STENOGRAPHIC RECORD BY:
16	Rhonda J. Hobbs, RPR Notary Public
17	Stenographic Reporter
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	Connor + Associates, Inc.
24	1650 One American Square Indianapolis, IN 46282
25	(317) 236-6022

1	1	
1		INDIANA ELECTION COMMISSION
2	,	mbawas E Whooler II (Chairman)
3	Mr.	Thomas E. Wheeler, II (Chairman) S. Anthony Long, Commission Member
4	Mr. Ms.	Daniel A. Dumezich, Commission Member Sarah Steele Riordan, Commission Member
5		
6		
7		INDIANA ELECTION DIVISION
8		
9	Mr. Ms.	Dale Simmons - Co-General Counsel Leslie Barnes - Co-General Counsel
	Mr.	Bradley King - Co-Director Pamela Potesta - Co Director
10	Ms.	Pamera Potesta Co Director
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. I'm going to call the meeting of the Indiana Election Commission to order. It's Friday, August 1, 2008. The Commission is meeting pursuant to a I have to my right notice previously published. 5 Commissioner Dumezich, and I have to my left 6 Commissioner Riordan, Commissioner Long should be here in a moment. 8 As a consequence of that, we're going to go 9 a little bit out of order and hear a couple of 10 things that we can hear with just three 11 commissioners here. 12 13 14

What I'd like to do is invite the Attorney General's Office, which is Item 7 on the agenda, to give us a brief report on the appeal of the Micro Vote decision.

MR. C. DURAN: Where would you like me to...

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: We don't even have a podium so wherever you're comfortable. If you want to come to the middle or stand there...

MR. C. DURAN: I'll just stand back here. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Chad, go ahead and introduce yourself because we're on the record.

MR. C. DURAN: Thank you. My name is Chad

19

15

16

17

18

1

2

3

4

20

21

22

23

24

Duran. I'm the deputy attorney general with the Indiana Attorney General's Office, and we have been requested to represent the Indiana Election Commission in a judicial review of the June 20th final order with respect to the Micro Vote matter.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And I've asked Chad to come here and give the commissioners a brief -- just a brief review of the status of what it is and what our duties are with respect to this while that Micro Vote matter is pending given the fact that it could conceivably be remanded to the Commission.

MR. C. DURAN: The chairman is absolutely correct on that point. The judicial review action was filed oh July 18th, and there is a preliminary hearing scheduled for August 20th with respect to staying the decision of the Indiana Election Commission, and while this action is pending, the protection of AOPA are certainly in place, and the Commission should continue to refrain from speaking outside of the administrative arena.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: With respect to the appeal, do you need anybody from the

Commission -- who is -- the party to the appeal -- I know the stay is to be issued against the Commission; is that correct, and the Commission's order; is that correct, so therefore, we are a party to the appeal.

MR. C. DURAN: The Commission is the only named party to the appeal.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Not the Division?

MR. C. DURAN: Not the Division.

with the Division, and I'll leave this to Brad, too, because this has been an issue, over -it's difficult for us to communicate with our
staff -- our staff or the parties during the
Micro Vote matter; should we still refrain from
communicating with the Division on Micro Vote
matters as well?

MR. C. DURAN: That's correct, until -until you receive further word from our office,
that would be an excellent idea.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Do you have need a commission member or a representative of the commission at the stay hearing; is it your recommendation that we have somebody there?

MR. C. DURAN: We don't presently have any

need for anyone to attend that hearing. Any member who wishes to attend is certainly welcomed to attend that hearing. However, one thing that we would request is that a point of contact with the commission be established so that we can communicate any needs that we might have.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I guess I'd make an informal motion that Commissioner Riordan be the contact for the Micro Vote litigation matter, since I know she's conveniently located not right across the street but right around the corner for the hearing; would you be able available to attend that hearing?

COMMISSIONER S. RIORDAN: I will actually be in trial unless we settle it, but if that changes, I will be glad to.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: If not, I'll make a motion for you to be there just to hear what goes on. Anything else?

MR. C. DURAN: Nothing further.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: We appreciate it, and we appreciate the Attorney General's Office staying on top of this and representing us.

MR. C. DURAN: Thank you very much.

approve the settlement agreements for...

. 4

1.7

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I'll accept a second.

COMMISSIONER S. RIORDAN: Second.

chairman T. Wheeler: The motion's been made and seconded. All in favor of approving the settlement agreements with the committee to elect Lon Keyes and the committee to elect Don Metzler-Smith, signify by saying Aye?

THE COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Those opposed, same sign?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Motion carries.

That's Item 2 on the agenda. I am now going to move to Item 6 on the agenda, voting system certification applications. It is my understanding, and again, and I will defer to the two co-counsels, that we can -- by three commissioners can go ahead and approve the applications; is that correct, with only three?

MR. D. SIMMONS: Yes -- Mr. Chairman and Members of the Commission, that's correct.

Affirmative action of three members of the commission would be sufficient to take official action.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Okay. With that

Τ

being said, who's doing what?

MR. B. KING: Mr. Chairman, in your binders near the end, there's a memorandum from the two co-directors concerning the voting system certification application -- we actually have three. There were two from Premier Election Systems, formerly Debold (Phonetic) -- there's a letter at the very end of your stapled packet there requesting --

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: The July 24th letter from Don Vopalensky?

MR. B. KING: Yes, requesting withdrawal of those two applications. They plan to submit apparently an upgraded application in the future.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. So the Premier is moved off the agenda because they've withdrawn their application for the present time. There is only the Hart InterCivic and there's a memorandum on Hart InterCivic in the packet dated August 1st from the co-directors.

MR. B. KING: And Mr. Chairman, the memo reviews the status of the application, the application form and fee having been paid, the escrow of the firmware and software having been

documented. The original hardware, firmware and software was demonstrated to the Commission at the time of its initial certification.

There is an independent testing authority report from CIBER Laboratories from August 2006. We did in the memo call the Commission's attention to the fact that following the issuance of that report CIBER as part of a transitional accreditation program lost its accreditation as an independent testing authority, but within the last month, it has been recommended by NIST, the National Institute of Standards & Technology to be reinstated and the Election Assistance Commission at the federal level has acted to invite them to proceed with the certification process.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: So at the time that CIBER issued their report, CIBER was a qualified testing authority; though; correct?

MR. B. KING: That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: So at the time the report was issued, they were approved, and CIBER is a laboratory that we've used before in a variety of different things?

2.4

MR. B. KING: Yes, that is correct. I don't know, Mr. Chairman, if Mr. Lawrence Leach or anyone else is here on behalf of Hart InterCivic.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Is there anyone here from Hart?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Any questions from the commissioners?

COMMISSIONER S. RIORDAN: Yes, Mr.

Chairman. So we are certifying or reviewing an application that is based upon a 2006 report from CIBER; is that -- do I understand that correctly?

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: It's a July 25th,
2007 application which included a report from
the prior year.

commissioner s. Riordan: So it was a 2006 independent testing for a report based on 200_ -- which formed the basis for the 2007 application, which we're reviewing in 2008, but the testing authority somewhere in the interim has lost its accreditation and has since been reaccredited; is that right?

MR. B. KING: If I can clarify, is in the

process of being reaccredited.

commissioner s. RIORDAN: I guess my only question would be, and this may go to counsel, and that is can we appropriately face our review up or down of this application on the 2006 report; is there any -- they expire after a period of time?

MR. D. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Commission, it would be my view that -- also, another piece of this is that they're reviewing this to see if they are sufficient under the 2002 Federal Election Commission Standards, so when they did that, they -- then that's currently our statute. We incorporate those standards.

When they reviewed that, they were accredited. That report indicated that they had passed those standards, and that would be sufficient whenever -- my view, whenever the application was submitted. It would be sufficient -- if they were accredited at the time, it's sufficient then and it's sufficient now.

COMMISSIONER S. RIORDAN: Is there any reason that we should be concerned that the

independent testing authority's report has become stale over time; does anyone have any concerns about that?

MS. L. BARNES: No, we do not.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Any other questions?

COMMISSIONER S. RIORDAN: No.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I'll accept a motion on the application for voting systems certification for Hart InterCivic and I will leave the upgrade numbers as mentioned in the memorandum. Do I hear a motion?

COMMISSIONER D. DUMEZICH: Motion to accredit Hart InterCivic for certification.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Do I have a second?

COMMISSIONER S. RIORDAN: Second.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Motion's been made and seconded, any further discussion?

(No response.)

thing. I would like the Hart people to come in and I would prefer them to have been here to have answered some of Sarah's questions. Put them on the agenda for the next meeting so we can talk about what exactly they're doing, and hopefully, by that time they'll be able to show

COMMISSIONER S. RIORDAN: How many counties 5 are customers of Hart InterCivic; is it only 6 Cass County? 7 MR. B. KING: Cass County is the only 8 Indiana county. 9 COMMISSIONER S. RIORDAN: And has anyone 10 heard from Cass County, in terms of any 11 objections that they have or are they a 12 satisfied customer, as far as we know? 13 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Is Cass County a new 14 customer of Hart? 15 MR. B. KING: Cass County is a relatively 16 17 new customer. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: They're -- Cass 18 County is one of the four counties that was left 19 2.0 in the lurch by whoever left? MR. B. KING: Yes, that's right. 21 COMMISSIONER S. RIORDAN: So we don't have 22 any objections of any kind from them? 23 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: They just -- they 24 just purchased that system because of some 25

COMMISSIONER S. RIORDAN: Mr. Chairman, let

me ask one question before you call for a vote?

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Please do.

1

2

3

4

us...

problems.

COMMISSIONER S. RIORDAN: I don't have any other further questions, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Tony, here's your opportunity. For the record, I will note that a motion has been made and seconded that the Election Commission approve Hart InterCivic's application for voting system certification for an upgrade to their system that's currently being used in Cass County. All members in favor, signify by saying Aye?

THE COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Those opposed --

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: Before I vote, was there anything in the oral report different from the written material?

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: No.

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: Then Aye.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All in favor, signify by saying Aye?

THE COMMISSIONERS: The Ayes have it.

Those opposed, same sign?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Motion carries, Hart

InterCivic has been approved. I did ask them to

Му

have Hart InterCivic in our next meeting to walk 1 us through a little bit. All right, that takes 2 care of those items. 3 Now moving onto the next item I suspect 4 most people are here for. It involves the Clark 5 County Circuit Court Judge's dispute. Do we 6 have people here for Dan Moore? 7 MR. M. GILLENWATER: Yes, Mr. Chairman. 8 name is Michael Gillenwater and I'm here for 9 10 Mr. Moore. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Is Mr. Moore here? 11 MR. M. GILLENWATER: He is. 12 MR. D. MOORE: Yes, sir, I'm Daniel Moore. 13 COMMISSIONER A. LONG: You said Michael 14 who? 15 MR. M. GILLENWATER: Gillenwater. 16 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And then on behalf of 17 18 Mr. Navarro is? MR. L. WILDER: Yes. Mr. Chairman, Ms. 19 Riordan, Mr. Long and Mr. Dumezich, my name is 20 I'm an attorney in Larry Wilder, W-I-L-D-E-R. 21 Jeffersonville, Indiana, and I'm here on 22 behalf -- with Judge Navarro, who's to my right, 23 and David Buskill, who's the chairman of the 24

Republican Party of Clark County.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Is Mr. Pate here as 1 well? 2 MR. R. PATE: I am. 3 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And you are the Clark 4 County Democratic chair? 5 MR. R. PATE: Yes, sir. 6 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: There's a Democratic 7 chair and a Republican chair, and you are? 8 MR. J. VISSING: John Vissing, an attorney? 9 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: For, who are you 10 representing? 11 MR. J. VISSING: John Vissing. 12 COMMISSIONER A. LONG: Two S's? 13 MR. J. VISSING: Two S's, and David Mosley 14 here to my right, who's --15 MR. D. MOSLEY: Good morning, Dave Mosley. 16 MR. J. VISSING: -- an attorney, and Mr. 17 18 Pate. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: You guys are loaded 19 20 up. MR. D. MOSLEY: M-O-S-L-E-Y. 21 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: You've got Mr. Wilder 22 23 3 to 1. MR. L. WILDER: Your Honor, I'm used to 24 25 that.

MR. J. VISSING: And Your Honor, this is Nancy Kraft, vice chair of the Democratic Party.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Now what I'm going to go ahead and do is have the -- it is the tradition of the Commission to have individuals that are going to be giving testimony before the Commission be sworn in, and I will ask Mr. King to administer that oath, or Mr. Simmons.

MR. B. KING: And Mr. Chairman, do you want those who are testifying to take the oath at this time?

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: What else have we got? Are we taking testimony?

(A discussion was held.)

MR. B. KING: If everyone who will be testifying in either this matter or any other matter on the agenda which would include the grievance procedure, who plans to testify, please raise -- stand and raise your right hand?

MR. L. WILDER: In fact, Mr. King, the lawyers have to take the oath in this matter; correct?

MR. B. KING: The lawyers will be taking the oath.

MR. L. WILDER: We are so not used to that.

4 5

MR. B. KING: Please respond I do at the conclusion of the oath. I do solemnly swear that the testimony I will give to the Commission at its hearing today will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, so help me, God?

THE AUDIENCE: I do.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And what I would like to do with respect to this Clark County hearing which is both the jurisdictional hearing involving Mr. Moore and the Navarro challenge is ask the Division for just a brief moment and both sides of the Division procedurally give me a brief -- procedurally, where are we, in terms of the jurisdictional hearing and the candidate challenge and I will follow up with that question.

- MR. B. KING: Do you want to address the findings that have been made and there's a question under AOPA and the jurisdiction to the Commission?
- MR. D. SIMMONS: Well, Mr. Chairman, I guess there are several issues the Commission should consider. We do have a candidate challenge filed on CAN-1 so this is a -- in that

respect -- with respect to that an AOPA hearing 1 and so there are no disconsideration to the 2 party for that hearing. 3 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And the CAN-1, the 4 candidate challenge is Cause 2008-180 which 5 involved Judge Navarro; correct? 6 Right. MR. D. SIMMONS: 7 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: With respect to Mr. 8 Moore --9 MR. D. SIMMONS: And with respect to Mr. 10 11 Moore --CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: -- the CAN-1 12 challenge, he has been certified as the 13 candidate; is that correct, and that's why a 14 CAN-1 challenge is appropriate? 15 COMMISSIONER A. LONG: Judge Navarro. 16 Judge Navarro, I'm CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 17 18 sorry. MR. D. SIMMONS: The certification occurs 19 on August 22nd by noon. 20 I apologize. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 21 filings have been accepted with respect to him? 22 MR. D. SIMMONS: The filings have been 23 accepted by the Republicans, the co-director. I 24 do not -- I cannot speak for the Democratic 25

co-director on that. 1 COMMISSIONER A. LONG: We're talking about 2 Judge Navarro. 3 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Judge Navarro. I 4 just want to understand the difference between 5 the two -- the procedural standing in the two 6 cases. Navarro, we have a CAN-1 challenge 7 that's been filed; correct? 8 MR. D. SIMMONS: We do, and if there has 9 10 been a filing... CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Moore, there has not 11 been; correct? 12 MR. D. SIMMONS: There has not been a CAN-1 13 filed; right, that's correct. 14 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And that is why 15 16 Navarro is subject to --MR. D. SIMMONS: AOPA. 17 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: -- AOPA notice right 18 now? 19 MR. D. SIMMONS: Correct. 20 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And this one really 21 is currently set on the agenda as a 22 jurisdictional hearing? 23 MR. D. SIMMONS: As a request to the 24 Commission as to whether they have jurisdiction 25

at this stage to intervene and make some 1 decision regarding the tendered filing. 2 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: So the current 3 hearing on Moore is simply a jurisdictional --4 what's set currently as a jurisdictional 5 hearing, not an AOPA hearing; correct? 6 Correct. MR. D. SIMMONS: 7 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. 8 MS. P. POTESTA: Mr. Chairman, if I could 9 interject a moment on Dale's question. I, the 10 Democratic co-director, have not agreed with 11 Navarro's submission, but I have put our list as 12 well just for the record. 13 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I'm sorry, I didn't 14 hear you. Dan was talking. I apologize, say 15 that again? 16 MS. P. POTESTA: That I as Democratic 17 co-director do not agree with Navarro's filing 18 and I have put Dan Moore's on the list as well 19 for us. 20 MS. L. BARNES: And Mr. Chairman --21 COMMISSIONER D. DUMEZICH: Is it accepted 22 for filing --23 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Which one? 24 COMMISSIONER D. DUMEZICH: -- or do you

disagree with the CAN-1, the candidate's filing, 1 Navarro's filing? 2 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: It was accepted for 3 filing, Navarro's filing? 4 MS. P. POTESTA: No. 5 MR. D. SIMMONS: Okay. 6 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: That's why I'm 7 struggling with the procedural difference 8 between the two of these. 9 MS. L. BARNES: And Mr. Chairman, we 10 understand it was your request to place Dan 11 Moore's petition on the agenda strictly for 12 consideration whether the Commission has 13 jurisdiction. State statute provides that if a 14 registered voter of the district files a 15 verified petition questioning the eligibility of 16 a candidate... 17 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: A verified petition 18 on a CAN-1? 19 MS. L. BARNES: Right. 20 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: You agree that a 21 CAN-1 has not been filed on Moore? 2.2 MS. L. BARNES: Correct. Correct. 23 Commission has adopted a CAN-1 in order for a 24 registered voter to state why they think a 25

candidate is ineligible. The Commission has not 1 created a form, but the General Assembly has 2 allowed the Commission to consider cases in 3 which a candidate's eligibility is questioned. 4 MR. D. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, can we 5 address these point by point because that 6 certainly is not our... 7 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I understand you 8 disagree. 9 MR. D. SIMMONS: Absolutely. 10 But I want to CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 11 understand where Leslie is coming from now. 12 MR. D. SIMMONS: Okay. 13 Thank you. It was our hope MS. L. BARNES: 14 that the verified petition would place this 15 issue before the Commission for a discussion on 16 the merits --17 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Which --18 MS. L. BARNES: -- but we understand... 19 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Hold on. Hold on. 20 Which verified petition -- I've only seen one 21 verified petition? 22 MS. L. BARNES: There's a verified 23 petition. 24

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Which challenges

2

Navarro?

7

8 9

10

11

12 1.3

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. L. BARNES: It was submitted actually before the CAN-1 challenge form. incorporated with the CAN-1 challenge. It was submitted July 8th. Dale and I received the only originals. Neither he nor I file stamped it.

This is the one CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: called Rodney Pate?

> MS. L. BARNES: Right.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And says introduction, Dear Mr. King and Ms. Potesta, which is now the second page of the Commissioners' packets?

MS. L. BARNES: Right, and it was overnighted to our office.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And your contention is that that's sufficient to perform the same function -- this is sufficient to go ahead and either challenge the candidate or place Mr. Moore's candidacy at issue, in terms of AOPA in front of the Commission?

MS. L. BARNES: Correct.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Then why -- why was there a CAN-1 form filed on Navarro?

MS. L. BARNES: The CAN-1 form -- we felt by looking at the wording on the form that it is designed to -- for a voter to allege that a candidate is ineligible, and when the co-directors could not agree whether to accept Mr. Moore's filing, Mr. Pate had asked me how to get that issue before the agenda, and we pointed to 3-8-1-2, the verified petition, and 3-8-1-16.5, and it says the Commission shall resolve all issues questioning the eligibility of a certificate of candidate selection, a CAN-29 form.

ask both -- both staff at this point, does the Division -- what is the position of the two either co-counsel directors as to whether or not the Commission itself has jurisdiction in the absence of a CAN-1 being filed? I take -- your position is it doesn't matter as long as something's been filed; that's your response?

MS. L. BARNES: As long as a sworn statement has been filed.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And I take it you disagree?

MR. D. SIMMONS: I disagree. The 3-8-1-2

that gives the Commission jurisdiction says
there must be a sworn statement, as Leslie says,
that questions the eligibility of a candidate.

Now the Commission has approved under its authority to approve uniformed forms a specific form, the CAN-1 to question the eligibility of a candidate. Now 3-5-4-8, and if I can give you a page citation on that one, 3-5

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I've got it on Page 44 under approval of forms.

MR. D. SIMMONS: A) indicates that when the Commission acts to approve a form to use throughout Indiana, then the person must use the most recent version approved by the Commission to comply with its title, and then under Subsection C, if they haven't done so, that filing must be rejected. Now I haven't --

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. So as I understand your position, your position is -Leslie's position is look, all we need to file is the sworn statement?

MR. D. SIMMONS: Right.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And your position it's form over substance to require CAN-1 -- I don't want to put words in your mouth, but Dale

 $1\dot{4}$

3 what you're saying? 4 5 6 7 8 9 eligibility of a candidate. 10 COMMISSIONER A. LONG: Could I ask a 11 question? 12 13 14 15 been a filing. 16 Commissioner Long has a question. 17 18 purpose to challenge a candidate? 19 20 That's the words in the statute. 21 22 23 24 25

1

2

is saying you've got to file a CAN-1, and if you don't file on the CAN-1, you can't -- the Commission does not have jurisdiction; is that

MR. D. SIMMONS: Correct, and part of the reason for that is you question your eligibility -- you question the eligibility of the candidate, that's the words at 3-8-1-2. I've not seen anything that questions the

MR. D. SIMMONS: I mean notwithstanding the more fundamental question about whether there's

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I believe

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: Dale, is CAN-1's

MR. D. SIMMONS: Question the eligibility.

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: In essence -- so give me some latitude and let's not go into semantics. What if you have a filing for a candidate and one of the co-directors wants to

.

accept and the other one doesn't, which is apparently the case in both of these here?

MR. D. SIMMONS: Yeah.

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: And with no challenge for eligibility, how does that get resolved, in your opinion?

MR. D. SIMMONS: Yeah, on his -- is he
directing this to me?

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I believe he's directing it to you, and I'm trying to give both sides the opportunity to respond.

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: I think Leslie says this is a vehicle to get somebody that says I want you to determine this impasse at the co-director's level and get this to the commission to decide, and Dale says no, you've got to file a CAN-1, which challenges -- questions the eligibility, and my question is what if you have an impasse through the co-directors and that's all you've got, how does it get resolved?

MR. D. SIMMONS: And historically -- Mr. Chairman, historically, that has occurred at least twice, and it's occurred three times, but two have resulted in lawsuits to mandate one of

the co-director or both of them to perform their statutory duty to certify the candidate.

The co-directors have been sort of forthcoming advising the candidate if they requests something in writing because the certification deadline is not until August 22nd. It's important to get these things resolved because ballots are printed and we need to get these things resolved so they both have been very cooperative in saying this is our position or this is my position, I understand you want to know it now so you can have your remedy in court.

That's how impasses have been resolved between the co-directors, and that's how impasses, I assume, are resolved with the Commission. If they are 2 to 2 -- they're tied 2 to 2 in this case on the issue, then the only remedy there is to go to court. It's an impasse. That's the way we're set up. It's always been frustrating, but that's just...

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Dale, let me ask a follow-up question.

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: I'd like to get an answer to my question.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I'm sorry. I apologize.

commissioner A. Long: The question is you've got -- forget these cases, we've got somebody that's filing for office and one of the co-directors won't approve it or the other one or maybe even they both disagree.

MR. D. SIMMONS: Yes, and that's happened.

commissioner A. Long: Is there a vehicle to get it before the Commission who's statutory responsibility is to enforce the election laws for the State of Indiana -- I mean is there some vehicle to get it to us or do we just circumvent it and tell people to run to court?

MR. D. SIMMONS: My view is that there is no vehicle and the way to do it is go to court, and historically, that's what happened.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Let me ask my follow-up question then. Could not -- tell me what prevents a CAN-1 -- let's assume that they fill out a CAN-1 right now and hand it to me, do I then have jurisdiction over this matter -- I apologize, does the Commission have jurisdiction over this matter subject to notice, obviously?

MR. D. SIMMONS: There's two -- there's two

parts to that. One is has there been a filing challenged? My view is that there's been no filing 3-8-1-2 and the other statute applies here 3-13-1-16.5 indicates a filing may be challenged, and that was -- it's come up sort of like what -- what if somebody comes in two days before the election and files as a write-in candidate -- well, we have to reject late filings. If they need to address that, they need to go to court. So the first issue is has there been a filing, and our view is no, there's not been a filing, apparently.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Why has there not been a filing in the Moore case?

MR. D. SIMMONS: In the what case?

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: In the Moore case,
why has there not been a filing?

MR. D. SIMMONS: There's not been a filing in that case because there's not been a timely tender of a CAN-30. There's three documents related to -- well, with respect to a judge, four documents, related to certifying an individual who's selected at caucus to fill a ballot vacancy. You file a CAN-30 notice at caucus, and at noon, ten days before the caucus,

you file -- you've got to file your -- and that's with the Election Division for judge.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: You've got -- the CAN-30 is notice of filing?

MR. D. SIMMONS: The CAN-30.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And the fact that that was not filed caused -- that's the -- that's the error here; correct?

MR. D. SIMMONS: Two errors.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right.

MR. D. SIMMONS: The CAN-31, declaration of candidacy also must be filed with the Election Division at least 72 hours before the caucus.

Neither of those were done. Now there was as -- we certainly agree and Mr. Buskill brought these documents in, there was a CAN-29, the certification of selection tendered to our office on -- before noon July 3rd. It was actually tendered about 11:20 and noon July 3rd was the deadline for that document.

It did have, I believe, a copy of the CAN-31 with it, but at that point -- you know, my view was that this -- we didn't have a CAN-30, that the other documents were timely, so this was an untimely filing.

1	CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: So a CAN-30 was never
2	filed at all?
3	MS. L. BARNES: Mr. Chairman, not exactly.
4	CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Hold on, let me
5	let me understand his position.
6	MS. L. BARNES: Okay.
7	CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Your position is that
8	a CAN-30 was never filed?
9	MR. D. SIMMONS: Not with the Election
10	Division.
11	CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: It is filed
12	somewhere?
13	MR. D. SIMMONS: Apparently so. I don't
14	know how the Election Division came to it. I
15	just know when we copied documents that somebody
16	in our office had been provided a copy of this
17	document, the CAN-30, and the CAN-31, I believe,
18	both were filed with the circuit court clerk of
19	Clark County.
20	CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And when were they
21	filed I assume they have a file stamp on
22	them?
23	MR. D. SIMMONS: I don't have the dates,
24	but I think I calculated those, that if they had
25	been filed with the Election Division, they

_

1.7

would have been timely.

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: My CAN-31 is file marked May 30th and at -- at least that's what they sent out to Mr. king and he sent it to the rest of us, I assume -- I believe that's where we got it. I appreciate that Brad.

COMMISSIONER S. RIORDAN: Mr. Chairman, I guess I would ask that in reviewing the CAN-30, CAN-31 and the CAN-29 issue, we're really getting into more of the merits and that goes beyond the jurisdictional question; is that fair?

MR. D. SIMMONS: Yeah, I'm just responding
to questions.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I don't -- I don't know that I'm getting to the merits because I want to understand -- I want to understand the basis for the jurisdictional part of the argument that --

COMMISSIONER S. RIORDAN: So do I.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: -- they have.

COMMISSIONER S. RIORDAN: So do I.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I mean that's what I thought, the reason they haven't made a filing is because it was not complete. That's why I

didn't want to get into the merits of it.

the jurisdictional issue to be framed more along the lines of -- the view that a CAN-1 is required, and that's what gets the jurisdiction -- that's what triggers the jurisdiction of this commission. A CAN-1 has not been filed but a sworn statement has been filed, and so the issue is are we going to accept the sworn statement as basis for exercising our jurisdiction; right -- is that the jurisdictional issue, and then once we decide, either we're going to punt or we're going to take it on and look at the merits, then we start looking at the validity of the timing of the required forms; is that correct?

MR. D. SIMMONS: No, not entirely, and I think it's because -- and I don't -- I just want to make sure you understand in this regard that my whole discussion on filing -- in our view, it requires a filing. I think you have to take two steps as a commission.

You say regardless of the co-directors' view here whether there has been a filing -- we find that there's been a filing, No. 1, and No.

2, we find that filing has been challenged notwithstanding that a CAN-1, a form we've approved for this purpose, has not been filed. I think it's really two steps.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: But the first step is is there a filing, and what I heard you say is that determination is in the exclusive jurisdiction of the co-directors and without, in your opinion, review by the Commission; correct?

MR. D. SIMMONS: Right, but I'm not going to go that far to say what your jurisdiction is. Here's where, you know, my -- my main obligation is...

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I'm considering telling you what I think our jurisdiction is.

MR. D. SIMMONS: You have every right to
tell me I'm wrong, the Commission does.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: You've espoused with respect to the Moore situation, is that a filing has not been made, therefore, the Commission does not have jurisdiction, and I assume even if they tried to file a CAN-1, a CAN-1 in your position would be inappropriate because there's been no filing?

MR. D. SIMMONS: In addition if a CAN was

filed today, then you'd trigger AOPA requirements.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I understand AOPA.

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: What if Mr. Pate would stand up and say I withdraw my CAN-1, my challenge to Mr. Navarro, what if he did that today, then I guess taking Dale's analysis one step further, we just go home because we wouldn't have anything -- there's nothing for us to hear. Our jurisdiction has been divested. I think that's --

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: On Navarro.

commissioner A. Long: On Navarro, and he says it's because there's no filing, it's been withdrawn, it's been dismissed, nonexistent, so we're in the same boat on both of them.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: No, because Navarro has made a -- at least the argument, I assume, is Navarro has been made a filing which then made the CAN-1 appropriate.

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: No, I don't think so. The co-director says she's not approved Navarro.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: That's why I -- my next step was probably -- I want to understand

it's the filing issue, and that's why I got -was getting into the merits of what was actually
filed.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:

MR. M. GILLENWATER: Mr. Chairman, if I might speak up for Mr. Moore. I would point out to you that the CAN-1 form is only for challenging the validity of a candidate. It does not have language on there that asks the Commission to certify the validity of the candidate.

there. I understand what -- I'll give you guys a shot. I'm working on the internal debate between -- and it's one of the problems with this commission, is we have both Republicans and Democrat and two of everything. I want to make sure I understand, and this is where Tony is going, --

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: We will resolve it.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: -- the difference between -- the difference between the two candidates and the procedural process of the candidates, because as I understand what you're saying, you think they're both in the same boat;

is that where you're going, with the fact that you've not certified -- you've not accepted Navarro and this side has not accepted Moore?

MS. L. BARNES: Correct.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And therefore,
neither one has a filing; is that the position
you're taking -- your position is Moore and
Navarro should be treated as the exact same
slot, they should be treated exactly the same?

MS. P. POTESTA: I don't think one has any more filing than the other. I believe that Dave Moore has submitted all necessary paperwork in a timely fashion. I don't know how else to describe that to you.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Let me -- that's why I got to the CAN-30 and 31, is I -- did Navarro file all of his stuff here in Indianapolis at the right time?

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: I think that's open for debate.

MS. L. BARNES: And that's open for debate.

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: Correct. He filed
in Indianapolis on July the 3rd.

MS. L. BARNES: On July 3rd before noon. We're just not sure which deadline applied in

1 that case.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I understand, but

Moore has the additional problem, as I

understand it, which is the CAN-30 was filed in
the wrong place, or the CAN-31 was filed in the
wrong place; correct?

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: I think it was filed in both places. It was filed timely in the county, perhaps untimely with the Division. I think we're clear on what the facts are.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Right. So that would be the one distinction between the two?

MS. L. BARNES: And there are additional --

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I mean we can argue about whether a caucus should have taken place and whether notice should have been...

MS. L. BARNES: Right.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And go through the authority -- I mean the appointing authority -- I understand that, and that's what I consider to be merits. I just want to understand...

MS. L. BARNES: Both certificates of selection, both CAN-29s came to our office on July 3rd before noon.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And they were, in

2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

fact, filed by the same person; correct?

Tendered by the same MS. L. BARNES: person.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And I appreciate Mr. Buskill's bipartisan -- bringing up the Democratic paperwork as well.

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: They, obviously, get along very well.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right.

MS. L. BARNES: And Mr. Chairman, there is a definition of filing, too. I don't know if the Commission wanted to look at the definition or...

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And I do, absolutely, and explain that together with what is the impact of this cross refusal to accept by the co-directors? I mean does that impact the status -- I mean I heard Dale, and I think he said that impacts the status, there's not been a filing, and therefore there's -- and the ability of the directors to refuse a filing, that divests us from jurisdiction, is kind of what I heard?

Yep, a break with usual MR. D. SIMMONS: precedent and agree with Mr. Long on that.

think he's nailed that issue perfectly.

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: I'm not used to somebody agreeing with me. I believe it's, in essence, the point of -- you've got all your questions...

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I've got all my questions.

commissioner A. Long: It would be my position -- let me make sure it's not my wife -- no, it's not -- priorities are priorities. I'm looking at 3-6-4.23, which is the authority of the co-directors, that's their powers and duties, and I'm looking at 3-6-4.1_ -- I had it here just a minute ago -- 14, that it appears to me that the co-directors are a subservient body, and I don't mean that disrespectful, but their duties are to render assistance in the Division and administration, that the Division shall assists the Commission -- this is Section 2 of 4.2, and the Secretary of State in administration of this title.

Their authorities are, subject to the following, carry out the policies and decisions and recommendations of the Commission, and then the Commission's powers and duties are to simply

administer Indiana election law. I think that is a superior position. It is my belief to so move and accept jurisdiction in both of these

2.0

cases.

I think that we're shirking our responsibility to the system to relegate it over to the courts. I think the courts always have jurisdiction to do what they choose to do. They decide their own jurisdiction so I think, therefore, we perhaps decide ours, but I believe we have jurisdiction under the statutes that I cited and would move that we accept jurisdiction on both these causes and render a decision — that's it.

COMMISSIONER D. DUMEZICH: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: A motion's been made and seconded, any discussion, Commissioner Riordan?

COMMISSIONER S. RIORDAN: Well, I guess

I -- I appreciate and am grateful for Mr.

Simmons careful reading of the statute as

always -- I happen to disagree, and I am also

going to vote in favor of this. I realize forms

are forms and sometimes form does become

substance in our work, but in this case, I think

it's not because the purpose of the CAN-1 is just different enough from the issue that the challenger has attempted to raise, and you know, this Commission cannot possibly address every single scenario that comes up under our sometimes wild and crazy Indiana election law.

1.3

And so I think in this instance it would be important for us to accept jurisdiction on both causes and to address these issues on the merits because what we tend to do frequently in most cases is to favor access to the ballot for candidates and for voters and so I think we really need delve through the jurisdictional issue and get down to that so I'm going to vote in favor of this.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I agree with

Commissioner Riordan as well, not for her

characterization of Mr. Simmons' legal position,

but with respect to the desire -- this

commission, at least since I've been on it, and

Tony's been on it a lot longer -- Commissioner

Long has been on it a lot longer than I have,

has not tried to elevate form over substance as

we have gone through here. We have a couple of

overriding concerns. I think we understand

those. Generally, we would like to see that the people of the State of Indiana have an opportunity to make a decision and not us, No. 1, and No. 2, not to elevate form over substance in that regard.

I also have some concerns with what I at least hear from the implied decision of the co-directors that by playing kind of the game got you, they came can divest us as jurisdiction and force the candidates to go to court. I think that is -- I'm not necessarily suggesting that happen, but I certainly would invite that, if we took the position that the Commission would not have jurisdiction in a situation like this.

I think the Commission provides a quick, easy and cheap, despite the multiple attorneys that are already here, method of resolution.

It's a lot cheaper than going to court, and it give you at least an additional shot to take a look at what the directors do have, No. 1, and No. 2 is you get a little better record from the court as to where we're coming from if you do choose to go that route.

So the idea that we don't have jurisdiction

simply because a director refused the filing and therefore we don't have a CAN-1, and I think our jurisdiction goes beyond that based upon Tony's analysis as well so I would vote in favor as well. All in favor of the motion, signify by saying Aye?

THE COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Those opposed, same sign?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Mr. Moore, I will ask you if -- you and/or your attorneys would be willing to waive the AOPA notice and requirements such that we can actually delve into the merits of your matter at the same time we delve into the merits of Judge Navarro's matter?

MR. D. MOORE: Certainly, sir.

MR. L. WILDER: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I don't want this to be interpreted in any way that Judge Navarro is waiving any of his rights, as a waste of his ability as either a taxpayer and/or a candidate to challenge Mr. Moore's candidacy as in the same manner that Mr. Moore has challenged his.

In as much as -- my sense is we're here today and the Commission wants to take up propriety of Mr. Moore's filings, and Judge Navarro and/or Mr. Buskill have not raised the issues that they would feel were salient as it relates to whether or not that that is a filing that should be considered.

And certainly, without the ability for us to go forward in the manner that we would hope to go forward with the evidence and the preparation -- certainly, the res judicata effect of any decision today would certainly be devastating to us because we are not prepared to address that because we did not raise this issue for the reason that we did not believe the subject matter of jurisdiction was clear and whether or not this board had subject matter jurisdiction based upon the failings of Mr. Moore's filings.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I understand your reservation. I'm not sure what the effectiveness of it is, but I do understand your reservation and that may be resolved at some point but not by us.

MR. L. WILDER: Thank you, sir.

commissioner D. Dumezich: At least it's very possible that we plan on resolving -- what this commission can resolve today and not hear this stuff again.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: There is clearly a commitment on that for a variety of different reasons, and I think that's -- that's to be fair to the candidates as well because I believe we've got 96 days before the election. You want to be focusing on him during the election rather than doing this in front of us.

MR. L. WILDER: Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: With that being said, procedurally, do any of the commissioners have a feeling for how we want to hear this?

commissioner A. Long: I would make an observation that both sides of this issue have presented us with sufficient facts that we have -- I have, and I've read these things, I think a reasonably thorough understanding of where they are factually.

I think if they have anything to add, I would for one adopt or recommend the adoption of the -- his principle and presentation of this, don't tell us what we already know. If you know

something that we don't know or maybe you do
that we don't know, I would certainly invite
that, but everything has been put into
petitions, responses and letters that have been
tendered with these filings, and I don't use
that term legally, but I think all the
commissioners are fully abreast of that.

It would be counterproductive in my mind to rehash those things. I think we know what the facts are, I believe we understand what the law is, but if they want to give us a brief amount of time -- I don't want to cut anybody off, but judges sometimes do that to me and I guess it's okay. With all due respect, I'm going to get over to Clark County some day, is my understanding. Sometimes shorter is better.

commissioner D. Dumezich: You said you're not going to get over to Clark County. How about three minutes each side, and let's go.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: What I'd like to do

is I'm going to go ahead -- everybody on the

Commission have read this and I think most of us

have researched it ourself as well as

consulting -- I suspect you consulted with

Democratic counsel and we certainly consulted

with our counsel and are apprised of this. With that being said, I'm going to go ahead and give...

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: I think we have one duty, I'm sorry. I'm thinking of our counsel, Mr. White. Don't you think we ought to disclose that we received this?

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Yeah, you should because I think that came to all of the commissioners here. Are you going to put your copy in the record?

received -- we all received a letter

purportedly, and I don't -- I don't know what

this entity is -- Southern Indiana Legislators,

but it purports to be signed by seven

legislators on this issue. I think that we try

to make disclosure. I think it's our obligation

when we've had outside contact.

I did look at one of the legislator's -- I did read that letter so I disclose it. I individually received a letter from a young lady by the name of Sharon Routh, R-O-U-T-H, that -- I have not read all of her letter, and I don't mind giving you a copy -- I want to read it

later because I know her. She used to be an 1 employee in my office years ago, and there was a 2 little cover letter, a sticky, and I did read 3 that, and it said don't know if you remember me, 4 and Frank is your husband -- she worked for us 5 back in 1983, sent the letter to me, and I want .6 to follow up and contact her later and say hi, 7 but I received that and I have not read it, the 8 substance part of the letter, so I make that 9 disclosure, and here's my copy of the Southern 10 Indiana Legislators. 11

MS. L. BARNES: We'll make sure it gets in the record.

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2.2

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Are you done now?

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I believe each of the commissioners received that and I know I certainly reviewed it. I would note for the record and certainly make a copy, but Mr. Wilder, I believe, that is in support of keeping all the candidates on the ballot, at least Mr. Moore on the ballot. It was written by all of the signatory legislators, two senators before a congressional -- four house members are all -- happen to be Southern Indiana Democrats,

at least based upon my brief review -- one, I 1 believe, who's running for lieutenant governor. 2 COMMISSIONER A. LONG: I did recognize 3 that. 4 MR. D. BUSKILL: Are any of them residents 5 of Clark County? 6 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I don't know the answer to that. 8 MR. L. WILDER: I would suspect not. 9 MR. D. MOORE: No, sir, it's not. None of 10 them are residents of Clark County. 11 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: For that -- for 12 what -- at least from my standpoint, it is 13 really for what it's worth. 14 COMMISSIONER A. LONG: We make the 15 disclosure for technical legal reasons and 16 certainly not belabor it. 17 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I'm not, but I 18 appreciate the input from the other branch. 19 With that being said and with the admonition of 20 the commission members -- I will siding with 21 Commissioner Dumezich, and I'm going to give 22 five minutes to each side. You can address any 23 of the issues that you wish to address with 24 respect to the Pate filing or the Moore

candidacy. I will start with the representative -- Mr. Moore, if you wish to share some of your time with Mr. Pate or his attorney, you're welcomed to do that.

MR. M. GILLENWATER: So that I understand, you are putting Mr. Pate's complaint and Mr. Moore's position in the same basket, so we have to do that in five minutes?

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Correct.

MR. M. GILLENWATER: How do you want to do this?

MR. R. PATE: It's your call.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I suspect it'll be useful for the commission members if you were doing some comparing in contrast between the two situations. Certainly, it asks for that.

MR. D. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, the court reporter has asked that they identify before they speak.

MR. J. VISSING: John Vissing, 432 East

Court Avenue, Jeffersonville, 624-10. We have a mess here that none of us made. Clark Circuit

Court was not due to be up for election this year. Judge Donahue is a married to a cousin of mine, who is a diabetic. They want to -- she's

had a heart attack -- he wants to take her and move to Seattle, take her autistic child and be near their other child and move to Vancouver, and he has elected to leave the bench two years early.

Now we done that -- if he had followed out his term -- no one in Clark County has ever dealt with this situation before, all right, never dealt with these forms in this capacity before. We also note that Dan made the decision to resign and talked about it for months, but he didn't resign until June the 1st, and I would maintain that he was the judge until June the 1st.

He could have said, you know, I change my mind -- he's got a house that hasn't sold, he could have said you know, I'm not going to leave, and there's no one who could have taken him out of office. Now I think holding a caucus on March 4th, the Republicans is incorrect. They didn't file their notice. There's no filing at all. David, do you want to share that with them, from that caucus?

MR. D. MOSLEY: My name Dave Mosley, and
the reason that this is -- this part that's been

1 2

1.5

handed to me is because when these issues arose, it was my job to try to find out what I could about the Republican meeting that occurred on March 4th.

This is the meeting -- this has to do with the authority of the Republican chair to appoint a candidate, which is one of the methods by which a vacancy can be filled, so what I'm looking at, Indiana Code Section that talks about I believe -- it's 3-1 --

MS. L. BARNES: 3-13-1.6.

MR. D. MOSLEY: Yeah, 3-13-1.6, and that provides for a meeting, a committee meeting which we understand is defined as the precinct committeemen or women of the -- from the Republican Party to meet and under caucus and give that authority their county chair.

Now when Mr. Navarro submitted his CAN form, he identified himself as being appointed by caucus. We looked at those requirements.

There was not a notice of a caucus filed. There was simply this March 4th, which I think is in your material, designating here's the meeting minutes of this caucus, I believe, that he called it, where the authority at that meeting

2.4

was given to the Chairman, Mr. Buskill, to appoint vacancies of the candidates.

"caucus," I look at the statute, and it uses the
word "County Committee?"

MR. D. MOSLEY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Are you using caucus and committee interchangeably or not?

MR. D. MOSLEY: Well, for these purposes, I am, because I understand that both parties have defined committee meeting to mean a meeting of their precinct committeemen or women. In any case, factually, I contacted -- got the list of precinct committeemen appointed and elected for the Republican Party in Clark County, and selected ten persons who I've contacted, and I've got a affidavit about that process, that I tendered to the --

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Affidavit by whom?

MR. D. MOSLEY: By me, about what I did.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: You weren't at any of these meetings, you're just telling me what people told you?

MR. D. MOSLEY: Yes.

MR. L. WILDER: With all due respect, Mr.

Wheeler, I realize this is an administrative proceeding, however, I think it would be remiss for this committee to take double hearsay from Mr. Mosley.

He's going to purport to say things that precinct committee people or the Republican Party allegedly said to him. I think if the Republican Party had any problem with that procedure, then the proper method and who had standing to challenge that meeting would be a member of the Republican Party, either through an action -- or raising some action here, and I'm not sure how they can raise it here.

So I don't think that this is appropriate.

I don't think they have standing to challenge an internal meeting of the party because the parties as we know are established by the rules that are established by the party.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: My concern isn't so much that. You weren't there?

MR. D. MOSLEY: No.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Did you call any of these people or subpoena any of these people or is there anybody here?

MR. D. MOSLEY: When you say call, I

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

called --

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: As much as I want to hear you tell me what they told you -- I'm not giving that a lot of credibility, I'd rather see somebody who was sitting here that was there.

MR. D. MOSLEY: Sure.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Do you have anybody?

MR. D. MOSLEY: No, we don't.

MR. M. GILLENWATER: Mr. Chairman, what we
have done --

MR. J. VISSING: Excuse me, Michael, I would like to finish up one point. As I'm here on behalf of Mr. Pate and the Democratic Party, what I do think is -- if there is a requirement of a called committee, you're going to find no evidence of that being filed either in Clark County Circuit Court Clerk's Office or here. So if there is a requirement of notice, you're not going to find evidence of that here. And, of course, I'm prepared to tell you what I learned when I talked to these committee persons about this meeting -- if you determine that's not appropriate to hear, fine, but I know that that is a deficiency in that meeting that I think divests that there wasn't sufficient authority.

MR. D. MOSLEY:

25

I think that as is part of

the election law, my understanding is that the committee that's referred to in those sections has been defining accepted by both parties as the precinct committeemen and women and vices but we don't have vices in this case so...

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Sarah.

commissioner s. Riordan: I just wanted to understand what the significance -- without going into the substance of what you were told by the Republican committee people, the reason why -- your position, if I understand it, is as of March 4th when the Republican Party conducted its caucus or its committee, there was no vacancy to fill?

MR. D. MOSLEY: That's Jack's part, yeah.

COMMISSIONER S. RIORDAN: So regardless of what happened at that meeting, what you're saying is what took place at that meeting could not have effectively given anyone of the Republican Party the authority to fill a vacancy on the ballot?

MR. D. MOSLEY: Correct.

COMMISSIONER S. RIORDAN: Understood.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. Under that position, could they say -- could they have

said at that meeting if there is a vacancy, we anticipate a vacancy, we authorize the county chairman to fill that vacancy if there should be a vacancy; would you agree with me that they could have done that?

MR. D. MOSLEY: You know, I think.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I mean legally, they could have done that; correct?

MR. D. MOSLEY: I believe that and you know...

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And in fact, that happens throughout the state all the time. I believe we have -- I believe we had eight judicial vacancies in other counties that were filled in in that exact same fashion?

MR. D. MOSLEY: I think you're exactly right. I think the traditional -- I think the history of the selections have been just that. I do think that if you take a strict reading of this statute, then you'll find that there's a deficiency there, and we wouldn't be bringing it up before this commission if we weren't -- if Mr. Moore's filing weren't being held to the jot and tittle of the law so it's our fundamental --

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: It's just kind of a

tit for tat kind of thing, they got us so we're going to get them?

MR. D. MOSLEY: Well, we -- exactly. We went through and looked at each portion of what was done to -- for the Republicans to select a candidate because we felt that the same thing was being applied to us so these are deficiencies that we found.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Would you agree with me, could a county committee meet in 2004 and give ongoing authorization and say our policy and practice of this county is that the county chair has the authority to fill any vacancies, any ballot vacancies that come up?

MR. D. MOSLEY: No, no, because who -- who is that meaning? If you don't have a notice of the -- to go after the precinct people where they can convene and vote, and there --

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: You've got a
legitimate meeting.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And the notice simply says we're going to have a meeting, we're going to have an appropriately -- appropriate noticed meeting that says we are giving -- my question is do you have to have this meeting every time a

vacancy occurs or can you give a county chair the authority that any time a vacancy occurs, he has ongoing authority to fill that vacancy, and I would suggest to you that's the way that most -- most of the counties in Indiana do that.

MR. M. GILLENWATER: Again, Michael
Gillenwater for the court reporter. That would
be okay if you were convening in one year -given authority for the same year for something
that was on the ballot that you anticipated, but
when something occurs that's not anticipated or
you go beyond the term of your office as a
precinct committeeman, you cannot give authority
for somebody to do something two years from now
if there is a different precinct committeemen
because those precinct committeemen who are
members of the committee have the right to vote
on this.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: But the authority -the authority can be given just by the county -the executive committee; correct, under
Section...

MR. M. GILLENWATER: Not without a properly called meeting, not without a properly called meeting.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: A properly called meeting of those individuals.

MR. M. GILLENWATER: Of the committee and the committee is more than the executive committee.

permanent rules associated with your committees -- they could be incorporated into the permanent rules, and it would be the obligation of the subsequent committeemen to amend those rules if they differed, so I'm not -- I'm not impressed with that argument so...

MR. M. GILLENWATER: Well, I would like to move forward to a different position. It's somewhat relative to that but it's more clear. This vacancy occurred because Judge Donahue resigned prior to the time his office was over.

The vacancy occurred on June 1st. It did not occur when he tendered his letter of intent to resign. It occurred on June 1st. You can interpret it how you want, but the Supreme Court has said that the vacancy occurs when the office is empty. That happened on June 1st.

That vacancy, I.C. 3-13-1-15 Subsection D,

has to be appointed and notice of that appointment has to be filed in the 2 commissioner -- in the Division within 72 hours.

That did not happen in this case.

The meeting, or the appointment occurred on June 23rd, which meant it should have been here by June 26th. It was not here by June 26th. all agree on that. It wasn't -- it was filed in Clark County but it was refiled here -- just like Mr. Moore's was filed in Clark County and later refiled here, but it was not done in a timely manner if you look at this statute.

Now the statute says that if it's a primary vacancy, it can be filed by July 3rd, and that's what both county chairmen thought they were doing because these forms are not as clear as we would like them to be -- in fact, they contain other errors, and I don't want to go into that because we put some of that in our written materials.

But the forms are not as clear as we would like them to be. Obviously, both county chairmen had trouble understanding those forms. All of the documents that are required got here by July 3rd, and we would submit that, as we've

1

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

heard today, that you should try and interpret these laws in such a way as to encourage fair

The Indiana Supreme Court says the intent of the election laws and the efforts of the commission should be to secure to the electorate an opportunity to freely and fairly cast his ballot and to uphold the will of the electorate and prevent disenfranchisement. In the absence of fraud, actual or suggested, statutes must be liberally construed to accomplish this purpose.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Let me back you up and ask you -- you gave me a cite to 115(d), I thought?

MR. M. GILLENWATER: Yes.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Now explain to me the distinction that you're making, and I want to you explain it so that Mr. Wilder will be able to respond to it --

MR. M. GILLENWATER: That's fine.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: -- because I want to make sure I understand it and I want Mr. Wilder to respond to it.

MR. M. GILLENWATER: When there's a vacancy in the office of the circuit court judge, the

elections.

vacancy -- well, there's two types of vacancies, 1 and under 3-13-1-15, and I think we will need to 2 look under Subsection C and Subsection D, 3 Subsection C says "This subsection applies to a 4 candidate vacancy resulting from a vacancy on 5 the primary election ballot." 6 Okay, primary election ballot -- we will 7 agree that Judge Donahue's office was not over 8 for another couple of years. There was not a 9

vacancy on the primary election ballot. I think we can all agree on that.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And I just want to understand because I don't think I did understand that. When does Donahue's current term expire?

MR. M. GILLENWATER: In a couple of years.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: He's 2010?

2010. MR. M. GILLENWATER:

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Okay, that's one of the things that I didn't understand.

MR. M. GILLENWATER: Subsection D, "This subsection applies to all candidate vacancies not described by subsection (c)". Those can be through withdrawal from -- a death from a resignation. The certificate required shall be

17 18

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19 20

21

22

23

24

filed not more than three days excluding Saturdays and Sundays after selection of the candidate.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And what you're saying is both sides screwed this up because they were looking at Section C, not D -- you both did the same thing?

MR. M. GILLENWATER: That's correct. The form says you can file this with the local clerk's office or the state office. It seems to say that you can do one or the other -- in fact, there's several options there. It doesn't say it has to be filed at the Division under this circumstance.

I think this is an unusual occurrence.

It's not likely to reoccur. To my knowledge or anybody I've spoken to, it's never happened in Clark County before where a sitting judge resigned after the primary but before the general election and I believe that both chairmen were confused -- it's obvious, or they would have filed their paperwork in a timely manner.

The way I understand this or see this, the Commission has a couple of options that are

available to it in order to try and help the people vote here and not disenfranchise them.

You can determine in your reading of the statutes that there has been substantial compliance, that the forms that we've filed, albeit it may be in the wrong place, the Clark County Circuit Court Clerk, they all got here by July 3rd, they were filed in a timely manner where they needed to be filed or someplace where the public could see them -- in fact, more than necessary was done because it was even published in the newspaper on the Democrat's part. You can balance the benefit of an election --

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. Let's get past this. What are you asking that we do?

MR. M. GILLENWATER: I'm asking that you do one or two things, that you either find that both candidates are on the ballot by saying there's substantial compliance. In good faith, they filed it in Clark County, it got here eventually before July 3rd, and advise your division directors, co-directors that you would like to see them interpret the law in that way when deciding whether or not to certify these candidates, or in the alternative, determine --

because there is confusion that was created by the information in the forms — the misinformation, as it is, the statute that was cited wrong, and the language that was hard to understand, that there is an emergency that exists in this particular election year, in this particular county because of the resignation of the circuit court judge — in effect, midyear, and define that there is a emergency, declare it — you have to do that unanimously as a commission and give extension to file this paperwork.

If you do that, I want you to understand, and I don't know what type of law you practice, an emergency is in effect whatever you say is an emergency. The courts aren't going to look at that too closely. It can be a natural disaster but it can be something else.

There are two options. We are not necessarily on behalf of Mr. Moore asking that Mr. Navarro not be, or Judge Navarro not be on the ballot, but if you're going to apply the same standard to both candidates, neither of them are going to be on the ballot this fall and the voters will be disenfranchised and that's

not what we want. 1 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: What happens if 2 neither one is on the ballot? 3 MR. M. GILLENWATER: If neither one is on 4 . the ballot, then you'll have a lawsuit. 5 COMMISSIONER D. DUMEZICH: Before you... 6 COMMISSIONER A. LONG: Before you start 7 using that... 8 MR. M. GILLENWATER: And I understand that, 9 and I'm not saying that to threaten you, you 10 will probably have a lawsuit, but if not, Judge 11 Navarro will sit there until the next general 12 election if the court does not determine that --13 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: So assuming no one is 14 on the ballot, Navarro -- Navarro sits til 2010? 15 MR. M. GILLENWATER: That's my 16 understanding of the law. If neither is on the 17 ballot, the people in Clark County don't get to 18 vote on who their next judge is going to be. 19 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: They wouldn't have 2.0 got to vote for two years anyway; right? 21 MR. M. GILLENWATER: But they selected the 22 last one that was there. 23 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I understand. 24 MR. M. GILLENWATER: They will have 25

2.0

_ _

somebody ruling on their cases who they didn't get a chance to vote for or against.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. Thank you very much. Mr. Wilder.

MR. L. WILDER: I was going to say Chairman Wheeler, do I get the same kind of 5 minutes that -- there's only one of me and certainly more of them.

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: Certainly.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I suspect -- you and I know each other, I suspect that -- knowing you, you're certainly able to handle...

MR. L. WILDER: Hold my own. I've certainly been accused of that. What we believe is the most important aspect of this is Judge Navarro's filings were correct. They comply with the statute. He is a candidate for circuit court judge as a Republican in Clark County for the upcoming election.

Mr. Buskill's ability to appoint Judge
Navarro unilaterally was provided to him through
a meeting of the precinct committee people in
the Republican Party of Clark County on March
4th of 2008.

Now Mr. Moore's counsel argue that because

1.6

Judge Donahue merely tendered a resignation with an effective date, the giving of Mr. Buskill that right has some flaw, and I call that the suth sayer argument, because what if someone who run in the primary election as a Republican and won had died, so their argument would mean that because Mr. Buskill and the committee could not foresee a death, that in fact he could not unilaterally make that appointment.

So to argue that the mere fact that the Republicans only knew by virtue of a January 7th, 2008 letter that Judge Donahue was going to effectively be no longer judge on June 1 negates the idea that his resignation was effective January 1, 2008.

So taking that into consideration, the Republicans gave him the authority to appoint anyone necessary to fill any vacancies on the ballot for the Republicans. That does not require the type of caucus notice that the Democrats failed to undertake.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Why not?

MR. L. WILDER: Because the statute does not provide that you have to in order to have the meeting of the committee of the party to

vote to give him that authority.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Mr. Mosley tells me that 3-13-16 as applying 3-13-19 does require that.

MR. L. WILDER: That's an incorrect interpretation of the law.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER:

Because the -- there was MR. L. WILDER: not a caucus as described and as contemplated that is necessary to replace someone that the Democrats chose, Mr. Chairman. Had the Democrats chosen the same method, and they were certainly within their abilities, to have a meeting of the precinct people and bestow Mr. Pate with the full unilateral right as to who ran for that seat, it would be the same issue, and they would come under the same rules that we have come under.

I think everybody CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: agrees that at the March 4th meeting the authority was actually given, but that -- their argument is that notice was required and that notice was not given; correct, it wasn't filed with the Division?

> There's no necessity. MR. L. WILDER:

regarding that meeting, because the notice directly to the Commission has an attachment to the fact that this is a judicial office.

So there's no necessity because there was no ability to know, or there's no ability to contemplate that you're going to need to appoint judicial officers or a prosecutor, and there's just no statutory requirement that their -- that the Republican Party of Clark County notice that meeting every time.

I agree with the commission member who indicates that in 2004 the Republican Party could have bestowed that same unilateral right on the chairman and that the remedy would be for that party to ask for another meeting where they want to rescind, because as we all know, the party mechanisms are governed by the parties themselves.

So to go on, as it relates to the next set of facts that we believe support Judge Navarro as being accurately and correctly appointed,

Judge Navarro was appointed unilaterally by

Mr. Buskill with that authority. Judge Navarro then filed his paperwork. There's not the same three-day requirements that exists when you are

a caucus appointed candidate that Mr. Moore was 1 subject to, and going to that issue, Mr. 2 Wheeler --3 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: You're saying that 4 I.C. 3-13-1-15(d) does not apply? 5 MR. L. WILDER: That does not apply. 6 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Why? 7 MR. L. WILDER: When you read a) -- because 8 when you read a) it sets out what the county 9 chairman's obligations are as it relates to 10 someone who is filling a vacancy pursuant to 11 6-8-2 -- 6-8-2 is the provision where the 12 unilateral right to make that appointment 13 relates to Mr. Buskill, and then you move 14 down -- I don't think you read (a)(1) and (2) 15 and say (c) and (d) are not separate from (1) 16 and (2). 17 Do you think this COMMISSIONER A. LONG: 18 was a primary vacancy? 19 MR. L. WILDER: Pardon me, sir? 20 COMMISSIONER A. LONG: Do you think this 21 was a primary vacancy? 22 MR. L. WILDER: No, I don't because he did 23 not resign, so this was an appointment for a 24

25

candidate to be on the ballot, which he had the

right to do as a result of the March

4th meeting, and then the Democrats chose the caucus format which kicked in -- three days' notice before the caucus June 14th, which you guys know.

commissioner A. Long: My understanding is if this was a primary vacancy, you had until July 3rd to get it filed, and if it's not a primary vacancy, you've got -- what is it, 30 days?

MS. L. BARNES: Three days after the selection.

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: Three days after the selection.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Regardless of the method of selection?

MS. L. BARNES: Correct.

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: Yeah.

MR. L. WILDER: And I -- I disagree with that. The method of selection is what triggers the timing. They those the method. The method they chose was the caucus where they had --

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Where does it say the method of section sets the time -- I read the statute as saying if it's a primary, it's

July 3rd, and if it's not -- if it's something other than a primary vacancy, it's three days.

MR. L. WILDER: And we're talking about three days of being appointed by the -- having the caucus occur and the vote happen, then there's three days to provide notice. This was not a caucus. This was an appointment.

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: And I thought it was three days after the -- for filling the vacancy, for filing the certificate of the --

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Candidate selection.

commissioner A. Long: The appointing process, be it appointment or a caucus, then you've got -- you have that -- that event happens and that triggers a three-day calendar except for Saturday and Sunday to file the notice.

And you think -- you honestly think the legislature intended that if you have a big meeting of all the county precinct committeemen and they fill a vacancy that there's a different reporting time frame than there would be if the county chairman filled under his statutory authority?

MR. L. WILDER: And my understanding is

that Judge Navarro filed that notice on the...

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: No, I didn't ask you that. That's a -- that's a good answer, but the wrong question, wrong answer.

MR. L. WILDER: Well, that's the answer to your question.

you say that if the county chairman appoints under the authority of the statute given to him by the committeemen, that triggers one notice of provision deadline, but if a caucus is held and they have a meeting and make an appointment, that that is a different time frame?

MR. L. WILDER: With all due respect,

Commissioner Long, I misunderstood you. I was

talking about the three days prior to caucus,

that there was a notice that Mr. Moore and --

about notice. I'm talking about the vote, either one person vote as a county chairman or 52 votes of precinct committeeman and the act occurs -- we appoint somebody to run for this office; isn't that the triggering mechanism that starts counting the days?

MR. L. WILDER: And the 23rd is when Judge

Navarro was appointed and the 26th is when he 1 provided the appropriate filings. 2 misunderstood your question when you talked 3 about the three days. 4 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. So when 5 this side says that we both got it wrong, 6 okay -- as I understood it, they said both sides 7 screwed this up, they misunderstood, they 8 thought the date was July 3rd -- you disagree 9 with that; correct? 10 MR. L. WILDER: I don't disagree that they 11 screwed it up. I disagreed that we did. 12 COMMISSIONER A. LONG: When did you file? 1.3 COMMISSIONER S. RIORDAN: July 3rd. 14 COMMISSIONER A. LONG: When did he make the 15 16 appointment? MR. L. WILDER: On June 23rd. 17 COMMISSIONER A. LONG: So is that -- on my 18 side of the state, that's more than three days. 19 MR. L. WILDER: Well, we live on the same 2.0 It's just we see -- see three days 21 22 differently. COMMISSIONER A. LONG: I'm talking about 23 the west side versus the north and south, but 24

notwithstanding, that's obviously more than

three days? 1 MR. L. WILDER: He filed the 26th, his 2 paperwork in the Clark Circuit Court on the 3 26th. 4 COMMISSIONER A. LONG: I understand. 5 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: You filed it with the 6 Clark Circuit Court? 7 MR. L. WILDER: Yes. 8 COMMISSIONER A. LONG: You're late getting 9 it filed here; do you agree with that? 10 MR. L. WILDER: We don't believe we're late 11 because we don't believe that we failed to file 1.2 it correctly. 13 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Where was it filed? 14 COMMISSIONER A. LONG: Same place that the 15 other side filed. I don't understand how you're 16 not late but they are if they both -- if you all 17 filed in the same place? 18 MR. L. WILDER: Because we believe that 19 2.0 it's --COMMISSIONER D. DUMEZICH: A different 21 mechanism. 22 MR. L. WILDER: Yes, exactly, thank you. 23 It's a whole different mechanism, Mr. Long, and 24 that's what we're trying to get to. They chose 25

2.5

an election at a caucus which kicks in a different set of procedures.

The Republicans on March the 4th chose -- allowed David Buskill the unilateral ability to make that appointment, and what happens at that point is he had to make that appointment before June 30th and he made that appointment as a candidate before June 30th, that's the rule, and he had to have that paperwork filed here with the Commission by July 3rd before noon.

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: And my fellow commissioner from the north, I'm not real persuaded by that argument.

MR. L. WILDER: Well, I'm...

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: It's a good
argument, though.

MR. L. WILDER: Thank you, sir.

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: I've heard all I needed to hear.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Larry, you have two or three minutes to conclude, what are -- what are you asking for, tell me what you're asking for?

MR. L. WILDER: Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, what we're asking for is that the

statutes be strictly construed as they should be, that -- you know, we've got four lawyers here today that showed up for Mr. Moore and those four lawyers are telling you that those documents were too confusing for someone to figure out how to file them correctly.

I don't think there's any question. They didn't file their notice of caucus timely. Mr. Moore did not file himself as being a candidate timely. They had a caucus. The caucus was a nullity. He wasn't a candidate at his own caucus. Therefore, there is no way that Mr. Moore could be a candidate for circuit court judge in Clark County, Indiana because nothing happened that was correct to allow him that opportunity.

Now Judge Navarro was appointed correctly by the chairman of the Republican Party after a duly called meeting on March the 4th of 2008. The Republican committee members have not objected to that committee. You've heard the argument let the folks in Clark County vote -- well, you've got to follow the rules to get to the ballot to get in the box.

And we do not believe that Mr. Moore's

campaign followed the rules, and merely arguing that he didn't understand the statutes well enough to know how to do it isn't enough, particularly, when he, obviously, has plenty of attorneys that are willing to provide him with legal advice. We're asking that Judge Navarro remain on the ticket and Mr. Moore's candidacy not be certified. COMMISSIONER D. DUMEZICH: I make a motion

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

to put Mr. Moore and Judge Navarro on the ballot for the upcoming election.

COMMISSIONER S. RIORDAN: Seconded.

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: Seconded.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: The motion's been made and seconded, any discussion?

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: I just think that -do you want to start at that end -- you always get to go first.

That's probably --CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: that's the way the council -- we started at the They always voted first and had a far end. discussion.

COMMISSIONER S. RIORDAN: I appreciate the arguments of both sides, and I think it's another one of these very tricky situations that we have under our Indiana Election Code, which should be much much thinner than it is, but I think that, you know, looking at the relative positions or being asked to look at the internal workings of each party, and I know that the statutes call upon us to do that to a certain degree, but I don't see that any party did everything exactly the way that it was supposed to.

I think that -- my philosophy is that we error on the side, putting people on the ballots, then the voters get to make the decision rather than the four of us sitting here making the decision and so I'm going to vote in favor of my fellow commissioner's motion.

know, if we did it, and I don't mean to pick on Mr. Wilder, but I don't think we're here to -if we strictly construe every election law, we might not have any candidates -- certainly, in this race, we wouldn't have any candidates, and I think if we strictly approve all that you ask us to do, Judge Navarro is off the ballot and Mr. Moore's off the ballot, and I think that's not what we're intending to do.

I think we should administer the law. I think we should administer them liberally. I can nothing in this case where anyone -- either candidate has had any prejudice -- not one word of argument that has been made that because this error occurred on the other side, I've been prejudiced, my candidate's been prejudiced, not one word has been said.

We have each side saying we made some technical mistakes, and I agree that's the case, but I want the citizens of Clark County to pick their judge, and I'm going to vote for this motion.

COMMISSIONER D. DUMEZICH: Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: That's the advantage

of being chairman. I get to go last.

COMMISSIONER D. DUMEZICH: Having both the honor and privilege of serving as a judge in the general assembly, I'd like to say that the statutes are, in fact, very confusing. However, whoever is ultimately elected in this position, I hope they more carefully parse the statutes than they did during their candidacy, and I will vote for my motion.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: That being said, let

1	me ask one procedural question of the legal
2	counsel or either co-directors. If the
3	Division if the Commission were to split
4	2/2 what is the effect on the election if the
5	Commission were to split 2/2 if they were and
6	let me on Moore and Navarro, if we were split
7	2/2 on Moore, where would we be?
8	MR. D. SIMMONS: I think we would be
9	returned to status quo.
_ 0	CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Which is Moore is not
1	on the ballot?
L 2	MR. D. SIMMONS: Right.
13	CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: If we split 2/2 on
1 4	Navarro, Judge Navarro, where are we?
15	MR. D. SIMMONS: We're in the same place
16	2/2?
17	CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: If we split 2/2 as
18	I understand it, 2/2, there would be no
19	Commission action?
20	MR. D. SIMMONS: Right.
21	CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: What is the effect on
22	Judge Navarro's candidacy?
23	MR. D. SIMMONS: Since there's been a
24	challenge, there's a statute, it's 3-13-1-16,
25	it's on Page 422, since there's been a challenge

to his candidacy that has not been resolved, 1 then the way 3-13-1-16 works is that the 2 co-directors are obligated by this section to 3 advise the county there's been a challenge 4 filed, the challenge -- they shall not place the candidate's name on the ballot until that 6 challenge is resolved by the Commission, which 7 they would not under the 2/2 vote, or a court 8 within jurisdiction in the matter. So the 9 instructions to the county would be don't place this candidate on the ballot until you hear from 11 the Commission further or you hear from the 13 court.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Do you agree with that analysis?

> MS. L. BARNES: No.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Why?

MS. L. BARNES: Well, it's true that it takes at least three to take official action. If the Commission deadlocks 2/2, we interpret that the challenge has been denied and the candidate would go on the ballot.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: So if we were to lock 2/2, your position is, for example, on Judge Navarro, Judge Navarro would go on the ballot;

5

10

12

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

correct?

MS. L. BARNES: Yes. And at that point if somebody wanted to take it to court -- the person would have exhausted all administrative remedies and then they could ask the court to take jurisdiction.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: So if we go 2/2, according to them, you're both off the ballot, and if we go 2/2, according to you, they're both on the ballot; correct?

MS. L. BARNES: No, I thought the question was with Navarro.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: No, is it different with respect to Navarro?

MS. L. BARNES: If you deadlock...

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I assume it would because...

MS. L. BARNES: I hadn't thought that one through. I had thought this one through as I've been asked this question.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: As I understand it, the right side of the table is telling me if we vote 2/2, we split 2/2, and I've heard where the left side, and it just happens to be where we're sitting.

_ -

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: Procedurally -- if I can ask Commissioner Dumezich to allow me to table your motion for about a minute to make another motion, and I will tell you why, I think procedurally for our record we -- first to accomplish what I believe we have all expressed, the --

COMMISSIONER D. DUMEZICH: Agreed.

think we should have a motion to deny the challenge and then vote on that motion, and that takes the challenge off the table if it's denied, and then what I hear, and I'm confused is the steps of Judge Navarro's race.

I think I -- I disagree with my learned Democratic counsel here, that I think if his challenge is denied -- if our co-director has told us that she's not approved his candidacy, that I think their candidacy filings are on equal standing.

So what my -- my thinking is procedurally our record should show that the challenge will be denied and then go back to vote on the -- the only challenge that's been filed, and the only challenge against Judge Navarro, the one that

was filed by Mr. Pate, I believe, was -- that 1 that challenge be denied, and then I think it 2 would be right for the motion from our fellow 3 commissioner that both candidates be -- directly 4 be directly placed on the ballot. That gets 5 6 the... CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: That handles -- that 7 handles the administrative... 8 COMMISSIONER A. LONG: That gets rid of all 9 of our -- and it's only procedural that you can 10 get there; would you... 11 COMMISSIONER D. DUMEZICH: Agreed. 12 COMMISSIONER A. LONG: I would move that we 13 table the preceding motion for a minute or two. 14 COMMISSIONER D. DUMEZICH: Then you make 15 your motion. 16 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: We have to vote on 17 this one. 18 COMMISSIONER A. LONG: Second. 19 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: It has been seconded. 20 All in favor of tabling the original motion 21 vote, signify by saying Aye? 22 THE COMMISSIONERS: Aye. 23 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Those opposed, same 24 sign? 25

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Motion carries, table that motion. Now as I understand it, you have another motion?

make that the challenge filed -- was it by Mr.

Pate -- I have a tendency not to go by names

much, that the CAN-1 challenge of Judge Navarro

be denied.

COMMISSIONER D. DUMEZICH: Second.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Motion made and seconded, any further discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Let me ask this question again, if this motion breaks 2/2, which may be a moot point --

COMMISSIONER D. DUMEZICH: It is.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: If this motion were to break 2/2, the answer is Navarro would not be on the ballot; correct, pending court action?

COMMISSIONER D. DUMEZICH: I think that's where the difference -- the difference would be.

commissioner A. Long: And I think the motion is not sustained. The motion -- sometimes we've been advised to move in the

affirmative and then it fail. I think in that result if this motion -- if we lock up 2/2 here, I would turn around and make a move to approve and then I think it would lock up 2/2 and it's in effect denied, and then we move onto Dan's motion.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Do you agree that that's what would happen?

MR. D. SIMMONS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Would that constitute action under the statute which would then keep him on the ballot?

MR. D. SIMMONS: Not if there's a 2/2...

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: So if we break -- if we break 2/2, Navarro is not on the ballot pending court action?

MR. D. SIMMONS: True.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Okay, that's my question, at least on my side -- my side of the aisle has been through that, which my -- which means if we go on partisan, everybody's off anyway.

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: We don't do that.

So infrequently, I -- I mean you get those

newspaper writers in here writing their

articles.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I just want -- I just want to procedurally understand if we break on a partisan basis, you're both off, and that's -- from my standpoint --

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: Point well taken.

COMMISSIONER D. DUMEZICH: That is unacceptable.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: From -- from my standpoint, that is a bad result. That forces you into litigation. If you guys want to both go along and try to take each other off later, that's your business, knock yourselves out, so I guess that's my comments on this.

COMMISSIONER D. DUMEZICH: But we're not going to make you do it.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: If we go the other way and break 2/2, you're forced into litigation. At least this way you have the option of deciding whether you want to litigate against each other and file additional challenges.

From my standpoint, I'd rather see -because you're off if we break 2/2, okay, but
I'd rather see you both on and then you guys --

I'd rather see -- you guys can decide what venue you want to fight in, but I would rather see and the commissioners have clearly expressed our intent, that we'd rather see that fight take place in front of the people, the election of Clark County, and let them take a swing at it, but if you guys want to take another option, that's yours. Motion's been made and seconded to deny the petition --

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: The challenge.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I'm sorry, the challenge to Judge Navarro. Those in favor, signify by saying Aye?

THE COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Those opposed, same sign?

(No response.)

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: Now I move to remove from the table Commissioner Dumezich's motion and then bring it back up for a vote.

COMMISSIONER S. RIORDAN: Second.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Okay. The motion has been made and seconded which is to...

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: To bring it from the table first, get it back up on the floor, the

previous motion.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. That motion's been made and seconded, all in favor, signify by saying Aye?

THE COMMISSIONERS: Aye.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. Now we are voting on Commissioner Dumezich's prior motion which is...

COMMISSIONER D. DUMEZICH: Put them both on the ballot.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Is that at the direction of the co-directors?

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: Yes.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: To certify...

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: To certify both candidates for the election. That's the motion, as I understand it.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And does that have -to the co-directors, does that have the
practical effect of putting both of them on
ballot if the Commission directs you to do that?

MR. B. KING: Yes, Mr. Chairman, that has the practical effect, as far as I'm concerned.

I reserve the jurisdictional point made by Dale Simmons earlier with regard to the separate role

of co-directors, but if the Commission votes in 1 this case, I will certify both candidates on the 2 ballot. 3 Thank you. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 4 MS. P. POTESTA: Yes, Mr. Chairman, if you 5 so direct me to certify both candidates, that I 6 7 certainly will. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I appreciate the 8 cooperation of the co-directors and that -- the 9 motion's been made and seconded, any further 10 discussion? 11 (No response.) 12 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All in favor, signify 13 14 by saying Aye? THE COMMISSIONERS: 15 Aye. Those opposed, same CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: 16 sign? 17 (No response.) 18 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Motion carries. 19 COMMISSIONER A. LONG: Good luck to both of 20 21 you. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: We do have some 22 additional business and we've already received 23 the written report so I'm emphasizing the word 24 "brief." 25

MR. D. SIMMONS: Yeah, I just wanted to
know -- yeah, how much time. This is the first
time we've been through --

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Will legal counsel keep it down, please.

MR. D. SIMMONS: This involves a grievance process. This is the first time we've been through this process so we're trying to feel our way through it and we think this is the first sort of case we can sort of set forth a template in how we'll proceed in others.

But basically, in 2002, the Help American Vote Act said State, you've got to have a administrative complaint procedure to address violations of the Help America Vote Act. It's important to remember that's what we're to address through this federally mandated grievance procedure.

What we do and what the co-directors did when they created the form was to create a broader form. It's -- it's broad and accessibility to -- and we contemplated that we would address -- we're not going to require the citizen to know the Help America Vote Act, to state a violation, we're going to collect their

concerns and then decide whether we're going to, you know, proceed under this administrative review process or under some other process.

The process set out in the statutes, and these are 3-6-4.5, and this starts on Page 60 that describes this administrative review process, is that the co-directors go through and decide first has a violation of HAVA been stated, assuming all the facts are true? If they say no, they've got to publish that in the Indiana Register. If they say yes, then they've got to investigate.

Well, what they did is say we think there might be something stated here so we're going to investigate, and what they did on October 11, 2007, was investigate several grievances arising out of the Madison County election — it was Anderson — an Anderson City election, filed by, I think the number is 25 different grievances with various allegations; some of them involving anxiety about the accuracy of the voting system; some of them about whether the proper review screen, whether the review screen was working properly, whether they had an opportunity to view and change their vote; some about whether

their absentee ballot was properly rejected. 1 We actually did an examination of the 2 voting systems on October 11th, 2007. That 3 was attended --4 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: So you went to 5 Madison County and physically examined this 6 stuff? 7 MR. D. SIMMONS: They physically examined 8 9 it. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: It was a highway 10 garage; is that correct? 11 MR. D. SIMMONS: It was a highway garage, 12 yes. Some of the grievants showed up for that 1.3 examination and this report is the result -- the 14 results from that examination. We did some 15 functionality testing. 16 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And the Commission 17 members all have a copy of the report and it was 18 circulated? 19 COMMISSIONER S. RIORDAN: Yes. 20 COMMISSIONER D. DUMEZICH: Yes. 21 COMMISSIONER A. LONG: Yes, it was. 22 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Can you just very 23 briefly summarize the results of the report? 24 MR. D. SIMMONS: The results of the report 25

were that we performed tests to determine whether votes would be counted accurately in those races -- they were. We tested to determine whether an under vote would be accepted in the race, and the race that was really at issue was the City Council At Large race in the primary, and we tested it to determine -- to have a look at the review screen, because we had several complaints about whether the review screen was proper, and there was some anxiety.

And our test of that functionality did result in us making some observations, the co-directors making some observations that it was nonintuitive, it was confusing, and there was some problem with that. We can understand why that might cause some anxiety among voters, however, we did not find it technically went so far as to violate HAVA, the Help America Vote Act, because you could actually review your choices.

You were always taken back to the screen, though, and it didn't tell you what your choices were. It either told you you voted for all in that race or you did not vote for all in that

race. That's the only information you got in that review screen. You could see every other vote you had cast, but with respect to the City Council At Large race, you only saw -- you either voted for all three or you didn't vote for all three, but the finding there was, again, no violation of HAVA.

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: Did you find that the instructions -- before we hear from the folks, the instructions, there was a deficiency in the instructions -- I thought I read that in there that they had to vote for all three?

MR. D. SIMMONS: Yeah, there was another allegation that they were given that the poll workers -- the instruction on the ballot is correct, --

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: Okay.

MR. D. SIMMONS: -- vote for no more than three candidates for this -- for this race. The grievants -- many grievants filed their grievance and explained, well, when I went to vote in Anderson on that day, I was told by the poll worker that I must vote for three or none of my votes would count.

And we did address that as a -- that's

contrary to law, that instruction would be contrary to law, but the ballot was correct in its instruction. The contrary -- the instructions given by the poll workers may have been contrary to the law in that respect. If they gave that, that was contrary to law. It may have confused some voters. It may have resulted in some votes that the voters didn't intend to cast. So we did make some observations there, too.

The other allegations were with respect to absentee ballots, and the short and short of that is co-directors can't -- their conclusion is they can't put theirselves in the place of county elected officials to make judgments about whether a signature on an application, an absentee ballot application matches a signature on the absentee ballot. They have a structure in place to do that, that is their assigned statutory duty, and the co-directors just do not feel -- and certainly, the co-directors could speak for themselves, feel comfortable second guessing those judgments made by those individuals at the county level.

MR. B. KING: Mr. Chairman, for the sake of

Mr. Simmons' voice, if I could just add one thing to that last point, one of the -- one type of grievance also alleged with regard to the absentee ballots that the individual who had returned the ballot was not notified, that the County Election Board had determined that the signatures did not match.

We found in examining, certainly, federal law and Indiana law, that there is no affirmative requirement, with the exception of military and overseas voters, to notify voters when an absentee ballot is rejected.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. Any other questions from the commissioners on the report?

COMMISSIONER S. RIORDAN: Procedurally, what's our next step, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: As I understand it, it is a list of possible actions that the Division has kindly put down. We can't -- under I.C. 3-6-4.5, we can affirm the report or amend the report or refer the matter to the Election Division for further investigation and submission of an updated report.

If we determine there's no violation, then we dismisses the grievances and publish the

order. If there is a violation, then we 1 determine what an appropriate remedy is. 2 COMMISSIONER A. LONG: We've got some 3 grievances here? 4 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: We do. It's my 5 understanding that we do -- I'm sorry, Sarah. 6 COMMISSIONER S. RIORDAN: I was going to 7 ask if voters had come to talk about their 8 experiences, whether the Commission is going to 9 entertain testimony, but I would like to take a 10 five-minute break, if that is what we plan to 11 do. 12 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I was going to do 13 14 fairly short testimony. COMMISSIONER S. RIORDAN: I would like a 15 five-minute break. 16 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. In that 17 case, we'll call a five-minute break, and then 18 we will accept comments and testimony regarding 19 the result. 20 (A recess was taken.) 21 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I'll encourage you 22 not to make a redundant presentation. If there 23 is a spokesman for -- is there a brief or... 24 MS. R. CRUMES: No, I just want to address 25

one issue that was in the report. 1 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. 2 Excuse me, Mr. Chairman. MR. B. KING: 3 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I don't think we're 4 taking testimony. 5 (A discussion was held off the record.) 6 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All right. 7 back on the record. As I understand it, we do 8 have two members of the county election board 9 here. Could you guys identify yourselves, 10 please? 11 MS. B. HUTTON: I'm Barbara Hutton. I'm 12 the Republican member of the Madison County 13 Election Board. 14 MS. M. CARMICHAEL: I'm Martha Carmichael, 15 Democratic chairman of the county commission. 16 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And then one member 17. is missing. I assume you have a three person... 18 MS. M. CARMICHAEL: Our clerk is missing... 19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She's on her way. 20 MS. M. CARMICHAEL: Oh, she's on her way? 21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She's at Fall Creek 2.2 and Meridian. 23 COMMISSIONER D. DUMEZICH: She'd better 24 25 really rush.

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

I was going to say. CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER:

I would like to explain MS. B. HUTTON: why, her daughter has a medical problem.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: We didn't ask Commissioner Long why he was late.

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: I can give you a long litany of excuses.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Something about a coal truck.

MS. L. BARNES: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, the clerk had asked us last week if she needed to be present if the Commission was going to take testimony and I had indicated to her this was not an evidentiary hearing. I don't know if that is a concern.

MR. B. KING: Mr. Chairman, if I could respond. I, personally, spoke to Lydia Watkins, the Madison County Circuit Court Clerk on Monday morning. I had faxed her a copy of this agenda Friday afternoon just as people were leaving the office, but I think it is a question that if the county election board members are present or willing to waive any notice -- objections, there's no legal impediment to the Commission proceeding.

MS. M. CARMICHAEL: No.

MS. B. HUTTON: No.

chairman T. wheeler: Okay. The individuals -- everybody speaking has been sworn because we previously swore them, so how many people are interested in speaking, raise your hand?

(The participants complied.)

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Okay. Ma'am, stand up and identify yourself -- you can stand right there just as long as the court reporter can hear you.

MS. R. CRUMES: Okay. My name is Rebecca Crumes, and I'm one of the complainants. On election day, May 8th, my machine malfunctioned and I understand I was given the wrong information so I'm not going to address that, I'm going to address the functionality of the machines.

That day when that happened, I let it go, and upon talking to other people on election day, I found that similar people had had similar problems with the machine so I started doing research. I also called the election board and spoke with a clerk, which I have a copy of her

1 4

notes that day, because I did report a malfunctioning of the machine, if anybody would like to see her note.

Also, when we contacted Mr. King and they set up the investigation of the machines -- we had several months to prepare ourselves for their coming to inspect the machines. Now I agree with Mr. King, everything worked beautifully that day, but because of my research, I knew what to look for and what questions to ask.

And even though I agree with everything that he said, I come to a different conclusion because my conclusion is upon asking you guys to further your investigation. When we got there, I asked ES&S tech about the internal audit report.

That report is inside the computer that will tell every event that happened that day. So I was kind of relieved because I just knew, since we had several months to prepare for this looking at the machines, that he would at least have that. He did not. He told Mr. King that that report was very lengthy and it took too long to report.

Mr. King then asked him to please get the report as soon as possible. I to this day have not seen that report. Also, as they set up the screen to show Mr. King, the election day screen, I looked at the screen, and that screen was nowhere near like the screen that I voted on. I relayed that information to Mr. King. I said that is not the screen that I voted on. It was a whole different page.

The technician's response was well, I recreated the screen as best I could. So then I also started observing the machines itself. My research had told me to be sure and look for ID numbers. I noticed on the compartments that the IDs were paper stickers. We took pictures. They're on a disk.

If you continue your investigation, I can provide those pictures, which show that the machines -- the stickers were on top of stickers, stickers had been moved because they left paper -- you know, where you tear off a sticker and place another one, there was paper left, and we took pictures of all of that.

So I asked Mr. King how do you even know those are the machines that came out of my poll?

He then says I don't. I have to rely on their information. There has to be some level of trust here. Well, because of all we have been through, there is no level of trust with me regarding our local election, so that also was in my notes.

Also, upon my investigation and research on these machines -- this was my first time voting on these ES&S iVotronic machines so I looked at the pros, I looked at the cons, I also wrote a two-page letter to Mr. Groh, the vice president of ES&S, which I never got a response, if anybody would care to see that, letting him know of some of the things that I was getting reports on.

I also got a copy of the Help America Vote Act which also states in Title 3 that records must be kept, a maintenance records of system errors. Also, this is our first -- and some of you -- it will be very interesting for some of you to look at this because these problems affect your vote count.

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: Ma'am, are these.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: You're probably
talking about the grievances?

MS. R. CRUMES: No, this is what I got from the clerk's office through the public access records, the problem logs of the machines that were reported on election day, things that were going on. Although they are poorly written and poorly maintained, but there is still enough on there that you will get an idea of what happened election day with these machines so...

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Do you have copies?

MS. R. CRUMES: I could get copies, but

I...

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: I would be interested in seeing the letter that you wrote to ES&S and copies of those, if you think those are relevant to the complaint that you're making.

MS. R. CRUMES: Yeah, they're relevant because they prove the functionality of the machines --

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: They show the problems going on.

MS. R. CRUMES: -- that affect your count.

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: I don't want to take

all -- if those are her originals, I don't want

to take her originals.

MS. R. CRUMES: No, I have another copy of

these.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Oh, so that's copies for us?

MS. R. CRUMES: Yes.

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: Give them to the court reporter.

MR. B. KING: Okay.

MS. R. CRUMES: And also, when I was doing research about these machines, I found out -- now these are the same machines that were assembled in the Philippines, and as you -- as some of you may know, the Philippines used these machines for one election and then they banned them because of the problems.

Their quality test consisted of a shake test -- if you shook it and nothing rattled, they were passed. Now this was a well documentary that they done, so these are the same machines that we're using. These machines have been banned throughout the United States -- several states had banned their use.

I'm not trying to put our election under.

I am trying to make this Commission aware -- we can sweep this under the rug, but we're going to be back, but there are problems with these

machines. Not only did it happen in May but also in the November election.

I also took like an informal survey and asked people about problems, and we had the same problems over again. When I went back to the clerk's office to publicly access the problem logs from each precinct, I was then given a letter by our county clerk saying they no longer kept problem logs, that I should ES&S.

Now I want to know from this Commission who is responsible for these problem logs, ES&S or the county, and if ES&S are responsible, how do we go about finding out what problems we have?

We can no longer continue to sweep problems under the rug and hope they just work themselves out or we disenfranchise enough people -- I think our voting records are low enough now, our voting participation is low enough, and then we wonder why people don't take the time to vote.

And all the people that I talk to that had problems, especially, some of those whose votes weren't counted, said that they would not vote that way again.

Now the reason I'm asking that you further your investigation is because of the research

that I've done on these machines and their functionality. Any technician can set up a controlled environment and show you how they work perfectly, but the fact of the matter is all of these machines are not tested before they're put out in the field. They only do sample testing.

I also found out in my research that the storage and the keeping of these machines also affect their functionality, from the climate, from how they're stacked, from how their — the climate control area — when we went to that area to see where they were stored, they were stored on a cement slab stacked ten high, which we took pictures of. We took pictures of the ceiling and the ceilings were leaking.

chariman T. WHEELER: Let me ask you actually a question and do a little procedural thing. You tendered an e-mail message here dated November 29th, 2007 to a jsgroh@ess?

MS. R. CRUMES: Right, and I got that e-mail from Mr. King's e-mail to me when he was sending me a copy of an answer of a problem.

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: Right. But you sent this and you said that Mr. Groh never responded

to this? 1 MS. R. CRUMES: No, he hasn't. 2 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I'm going to make 3 this Hearing Exhibit 1. 4 MS. R. CRUMES: Okay. 5 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: You also have given 6 me a list of call -- what looks like call center 7 logs related to election day voting problems on 8 ES&S's system? 9 MS. R. CRUMES: Uh-huh, some of them. 10 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Some of them that you 11 received, and I'm going to make those as Group 12 Exhibit 2, assuming no commissioners have any 13 objections. 14 COMMISSIONER A. LONG: No objections. 15 COMMISSIONER S. RIORDAN: No objection. 16 COMMISSIONER D. DUMEZICH: No objection. 17 MS. R. CRUMES: And these are from the 18 clerk saying they no longer keep logs so I will 19 have to contact ES&S. 20 I will -- I will make CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: 21 that Exhibit 3. 22 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And the same concerns 23 you're addressing here, you addressed to Mr. 24 Groh? 25

MS. R. CRUMES: Uh-huh, and that is my basis asking the Commission to please further their investigation and give people time to address you concerning the functionality of the machine.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I understand. My
thought on this, rather than going directly to a
report, because I think you indicated that
during the Division's review, things went pretty
well. My suggestion perhaps of the Commission
is that we ask for a response because you never
got a response to your letter; correct?

MS. R. CRUMES: No, but things went well because we were in a controlled environment --

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I understand.

MS. R. CRUMES: -- and that was not the
screen that I voted on.

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: My thought is to provide them this information and perhaps these logs and ask for a response, a written response from ES&S to the concerns that you've raised in this proceeding.

MS. R. CRUMES: And the problem logs from the November election and the internal audit sheets from that election that would have showed

all of the events on those machines.

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: I believe one of the co-directors...

MS. P. POTESTA: Mr. Chairman, I want to make on the record for our court reporter and for the minutes that Mr. King and I both worked on the machines all day and both of us concur with these findings. It was just not Mr. King.

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: The co-directors?

MS. P. POTESTA: Yes.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Thank you. I appreciate that. Let me go ahead. I need to get through this. There were two other people that wanted to speak.

MS. R. CRUMES: I just wanted to make it clear, did you put in your record the internal audit that will record all of the events that happened that day on a particular machine was not present, and that's the report that I am looking for, the May election and also the November election.

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: That wasn't present at the time that the Division...

MS. R. CRUMES: No. He said it took too much time to print that and he didn't have it.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Okay. We will... 1 COMMISSIONER A. LONG: Do you want to make 2 a request that her statement be transcribed for 3 them to get the internal sheets, --4 MS. R. CRUMES: Internal audits. 5 COMMISSIONER A. LONG: -- to provide that 6 and come back with an answer and have our folks 7 look at it again because I do want to hear from 8 the other folks. 9 CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: Who was next up? 10 MS. J. WILKERSON: I want to speak. I just 11 had one concern --12 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Would you just 13 identify yourself? 14 MS. J. WILKERSON: My name is Doris 15 Wilkerson. 16 COMMISSIONER A. LONG: Wilkerson? 17 MS. J. WILKERSON: Wilkerson, yes. 18 CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: And you're one of the 19 grievants as well? 20 MS. J. WILKERSON: Yes, I do have one. 21 CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Okay. 22 MS. J. WILKERSON: My grievance is 23 concerning the candidate I had voted for. When 24 I realized he had only lost by 21 votes, I was 25

very disappointed, because as I was voting on the new voting machine, I had to ask for help in which to continue, and when she discovered that I had not voted for three city councilmen, she said I couldn't go on until I voted for three.

I had only voted for one because I didn't have -- didn't know the other two, but I had to go back and vote for three in order to continue my voting process. So I was very disappointed because I thought that I shouldn't have had to vote for people I didn't want to vote for, so that's what my concern was. My husband's concern was the same and he had to go put more money in the meter so he's not here.

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: I think two commissioners have a similar position.

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: We'll accept his comments, and I'm sure you speak for him anyway.

MS. J. WILKERSON: Yes, I can.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I would suspect she Anyone else -- yes, sir?

MR. A. BIBBS: Yes, Anthony (Ty) Bibbs. I'm a resident of Anderson, Indiana, 810 West 12th Street.

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: I didn't catch your

2.4

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

last name.

MR. A. BIBBS: Bibbs, B-I-B-B-S.

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: Okay.

MR. A. BIBBS: I was a candidate on this disputed election, but I'm not here in that capacity. I'm here in the capacity to represent the voters that were disenfranchised, and I would like to thank you, Mr. Chairman, for having us, and I would also like to thank the Election Division and all the hard work they did in putting together this report. I have several things that I would like to put into the record.

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: Actually, bring them up to me and I'll read them into the record and get them marked. Group exhibit or do you want them individually?

MR. A. BIBBS: Individual.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: These are our copies?

MR. A. BIBBS: There's four copies of each

one.

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: Four copies of each one. Okay, go ahead, I'm sorry.

MR. A. BIBBS: All I have is concerns with the report and that's what I'm asking for you all to refer back to the Division so they can

continue their further investigation.

As a major problem on Page 6, other than the report, in Paragraph 2 it is stated that five candidates competed for three at large seats in a 2007 municipal primary. That's an erroneous statement. There were actually nine candidates -- Anthony (Ty) Bibbs, Rodney Chamberlain, Foree Dixon, David Eicks --

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And those are on -your Exhibit 1 actually lists all those?

MR. A. BIBBS: Yes.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: These are the official -- I assume these are the official tallies?

MR. A. BIBBS: Yes, from one precinct.

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: And if I can -- it does say unofficial results here, but I'm going to list that as Exhibit --

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: -- 4. I've just written -- wrote a small number on the report, pick them up later and stick a tab over them.

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: Expert record keeping. And so those are the...

MR. A. BIBBS: So I don't need to continue reading the names then?

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: No.

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: No. So your concern is that there were nine rather than eight?

MR. A. BIBBS: It says there were five -the report says there were five and they have
actual tables from that information, but there
were actually nine, so therefore, the
information in the report in that manner is
inaccurate.

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: Let me stop you there. What page is it?

MR. A. BIBBS: It's on Page 6, Paragraph 2.

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: So Page 6 --

MR. A. BIBBS: -- Paragraph 2.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: It does say five candidates, three at large seats; is that right, Brad, nine candidates on that -- I think the report is inaccurate, at least the one I'm looking at?

MR. B. KING: Mr. Chairman, on the sheet that's been presented, there are nine names of candidates -- Bibbs, Chamberlain, Dixon, Eicks, Ferguson, Harrison, Leever, Muir and Reese.

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: So the -- the report is inaccurate, when he refers to five?

MR. B. KING: The report, I think, reflects what Pam and I saw, because we were very thorough in going through the -- the various permeations and checking out the effects of under voting for the candidates.

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: That strikes me as an issue of concern then?

MR. B. KING: Yes, it does.

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: Well, it's six on Page 7, six candidates.

MR. A. BIBBS: Some of those were
Republican on Page 7, that was for the
Republican side, but on the Democratic side,
it's obvious that the machines were programmed
differently for when the Election Division came
to review them as to when they were programmed
on the actual election.

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: Okay.

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: It strikes me as problematic, what am I missing?

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: Well, I think that's a question that needs to be answered.

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: I think that's a legitimate question to answer, and I will ask the co-directors to look into that before we

approve the report.

MR. B. KING: Mr. Chairman, we can certainly contact in writing the Madison County Election Board and ES&S to ask for additional information for the Commission.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I do note that we do have two members of the Madison County Election Board. Do you have any idea why the machines as set up before the co-directors viewed it had five versus nine?

MS. B. HUTTON: It would be the same as it probably would be on election day, and frankly, I don't remember...

MS. M. CARMICHAEL: There were nine.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: There were nine, but as I understand it, when the co-directors viewed it, there were only five.

MS. M. CARMICHAEL: And it would be the same thing on election day as it was when you looked at them.

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: I think we need to take a look at that.

MR. D. SIMMONS: There was one additional evidence that were not able to obtain for today. The co-directors asked State Police Officer John

Kelly to attend and videotape some of the examination. We could not -- he's out in Redkey, Indiana, and we could not get that here for Friday's meeting, however, that is available to look at just to double-check to make sure that our observations are accurate in this report.

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: What I think is appropriate, as Commissioner Long said, have somebody to look into that.

MR. A. BIBBS: Additionally, in the last paragraph on Page 17, it is stated that there is no legal requirement that a voter be notified if their absentee ballot is rejected, and this has been standard operating procedure.

And there's a document signed by Ludy
Watkins, who's the Madison County Clerk,
secretary of the election board entitled,
"Incoming Absentee Ballot Procedure for Election
Room," and I gave you that as an exhibit.

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: I will mark that as Exhibit 2, or I'm sorry, Exhibit 5.

MR. A. BIBBS: It clearly states in the last sentence of the first paragraph that the election director attempts to contact the voter

(sometimes 3 & 4 times), if there is a problem with the ballot envelope signature.

Also, the next exhibit, it is in the election board's own documentation that they contacted Tami Howard, Jacob Phipps and Cassius Nunn.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And I'll introduce those as Exhibit 6.

MR. A. BIBBS: So as the report stated, that the -- the findings that were in the report, if they did notify one person, then they had obligation to notify everyone, and since that has proven to be not the case, then once again we would ask that you have further investigation.

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: Response from the Division?

MR. D. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, we just want to make sure, if -- if that is an allegation, then it wouldn't fall within HAVA. It's now a Help America Vote Act allegation that would fall outside of this administration.

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: So it would fall outside of this administration?

MR. D. SIMMONS: Yes, sir.

commissioner A. Long: In follow up, I would like to have the issue -- my state representative has suggested that that might not be a bad thing to go into law with, but if you're going to reject someone's vote, that they be given at best some kind of notice, a postcard or something and say hey, your vote was not accepted.

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: Okay, next item.

MR. A. BIBBS: There were grievances filed by Vikki and Todd Barron, that they were allowed to review their choices for city councilman at large. They voted at Forest Hills Elementary School. This would once again show that the machines were not uniformly programmed across the city, which therefore, in my opinion, would constitute a violation of HAVA, because you can't have some people voting on one standard and another group of people on a different side of town voting on a different standard, and that's documented also.

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: And I've marked that as No. 7, the Vikki Barron, these two statements.

MR. D. SIMMONS: And again, HAVA would be

very narrow -- does it accurately count? Does it provide review? It doesn't get into did you correctly format your ballot? Did you program it correctly? Those are...

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: So you're saying HAVA doesn't -- this would be an operational issue, because of the defect in the machine, it does not allow you to review; correct?

MR. D. SIMMONS: Most -- yes.

MR. A. BIBBS: They were allowed to review.

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: These people were, some people were; correct?

MR. D. SIMMONS: They were allowed to review -- no, not what we observed, not what's documented in the report. You could review but it wasn't intuitive. You had to hit a back button, you had to hit the office to get back to the office.

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: Which is presumably what these people did, except...

MR. A. BIBBS: They said they didn't have to. They'll come in. It was a two-day notice and you can have all 24 people here.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: In here, all it says is I was able to review my selections, and the

Division is telling us that yes, you could have done that, but it was just a little difficult.

MR. B. KING: Mr. Chairman, if I could add one point from my perspective. Assuming the facts as stated in the grievance by the Barrons are correct, it raises Equal Protection arguments and potential Section 2, Voting Rights Act arguments, but they're not Help America Vote Act arguments.

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: So not within the scope of this investigation?

MR. B. KING: Because here the Barrons are saying that it worked correctly for them.

They're not alleging that it didn't work incorrectly.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: But we do have grievances alleged that it worked incorrectly, do we not?

MR. B. KING: We do, but not by these two individuals.

MR. D. SIMMONS: If I could add -- as we put in the report, these type of allegations are also typically part of recounts or contests -- I mean those are good remedies to pursue to, you know, say this was not a fair election. You

can't possibly tell who won by -- by the way it was done.

way -- the way this really ought to have been done -- as a practical matter, and I saw it in your e-mail that you had sent to Brad, and you refer to the fact that if I had been able to get the recount or contest into court -- I take it you're agreeing with Dale, so how come -- how come this didn't get into court?

MR. A. BIBBS: I actually tried to get it but they said that I didn't properly verify the recount petition. I did it myself, and I didn't understand that there's a difference -- a legalese between confirming and verifying. I confirmed everything, but that wasn't good enough, you have to verify.

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: So they tossed it?
MR. A. BIBBS: So they tossed it.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Okay. But as I understand it -- what you're telling me, Dale, is that would have been resolved there?

MR. D. SIMMONS: Yeah, the HAVA administrative process is not a substitute for recounts, contests.

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: So the place where that got issued would have been the recount? Right.

MR. A. BIBBS: And that's why I began my testimony by saying I don't want this to be about me, I want this to be about the voters who didn't get the opportunity to cast their ballot.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: And I appreciate That's what I saw in your e-mail was -because I think you agree that had you been able

MR. A. BIBBS: Right, I've taken that off the table. I feel obligated because these individuals came out and supported me --

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Right.

MR. A. BIBBS: -- so I want to make sure I

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: Absolutely. you've made some good points that we're going to follow up on. Sarah, did you have anything?

I want to COMMISSIONER S. RIORDAN: I do. thank the voters and also the members of the County Election Board for coming. These issues are incredibly important, whether they fall under HAVA, whether they fall under the United

States Constitution, whether they fall under the Voting Rights Act or whether they fall under the procedures of the county or your contract with your election machine, that these are the kinds of things that scare me to death because

elections can turn on these things.

And even if -- if that weren't the scariest thing at all -- I mean the right of a person to cast his or her vote and have that vote count properly is the most important thing that we deal with here and one of the most important rights that we have, but I think we need to absolutely hold vendors accountable.

And I don't put any kind of blame on the Election Board for shortcomings in the performance of a vendor because you all have to take a huge leap of faith when you go into business with them and trust them to make sure that all of these matters are going to be handled exactly according to -- and there's a lot of stuff that you can't bear down on and know every single detail, and I understand that.

So I think that it's very important for us to raise these specific issues, even though it's too late for anybody to take action on the

1 2

2.0

outcome of the election, but we really need to make sure that these issues regardless of who has governance over them are raised with the vendors by the board of elections and also by the commission.

I think we have the authority and the responsibility to do precisely that, and I'm glad that we're taking all of these matters into the record, and I'm glad that we're going to be raising them with ES&S and asking them to respond, because this is a matter of extreme importance, and this is exactly the reason why we're here in my view so I appreciate your coming in and telling us about this and I also appreciate the board and understand the predicament that you're in.

somebody who cares about making sure that votes count, hold ES&S's feet to the fire -- you know, they get a huge benefit for doing business in Indiana, but they have a huge responsibility to make sure that things like this don't occur, and that's just my view, but thank you all for your...

MS. R. CRUMES: I have just --

2.0

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: Let me follow up, and we'll make a similar commitment on ES&S, particularly, with respect to your complaints, then I would ask the Division to ask for a prompt and timely response so we get some kind of response in September so we can deal with that response if we need to prior to the election.

Obviously, most of the large counties are voting on the ES&S machines, and therefore, I -- you know, I think it's important if we see that response before we go into the general election.

MS. R. CRUMES: And I have one more exhibit. Now this is a letter from the clerk acknowledging the problems that existed and a copy of an e-mail from the technician changing the programming so that we not have that problem again, but because I was unable to obtain by public records the problem log, I don't know that we had any problem.

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: Let me attach that and make sure that that goes to ES&S as well so they've got...

MS. R. CRUMES: So someone has to be
knowledgable in this programming, and is the

board supposed to be certified when they change the programming or change the programming in the machine, does anybody...

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: It depends on what the programming they change is.

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: But we'll work through it and we'll give them that information and we'll get a response and I will make sure that you get a copy of that. Your address -- her address is in the file as part of the grievance so...

MR. B. KING: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: I would move that our action on this report today that we refer it back to the Division for further investigation and the evidence that we've received today that they follow up on comments by the witnesses that have testified as far as specific items that they have requested and were not produced and see that ES&S is brought into the loop and that we have a subsequent report and that these folks who have taken the time to come here today be given notice when this next comes before the board. As a side to my motion, I thank you guys for coming up here to -- the election board

members.

COMMISSIONER D. DUMEZICH: Seconded.

commissioner A. Long: My purpose on the motion was -- I think there were some questions raised that are clearly outside of what you all -- your bailiwick. I mean you guys...

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: It's an ES&S issue, not your issue.

MS. M. CARMICHAEL: And something in defense of ES&S, we have a young man with ES&S that works with us and he is terrific. If we have problems, they're usually pretty well solved.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Tell us who you are so that the court reporter knows?

MS. M. CARMICHAEL: I'm Martha Carmichael, the chairman of the county election board, and I think you all will admit -- I've been doing this for over 60 years and no election has ever been perfect. I remember we did it on ballot, paper ballot machines punching.

MS. B. HUTTON: I was just told -COMMISSIONER A. LONG: Your name.

MS. B. HUTTON: This is Barbara Hutton. I was just told that our ES&S representative did

offer to come today, but he was told he was not allowed to speak and so he didn't come but he

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: He will get an opportunity to speak. I don't know...

COMMISSIONER D. DUMEZICH: By whom?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: When I said he wasn't allowed. He wasn't aware.

MS. B. HUTTON: She's on the registration

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'm on the

MR. A. BIBBS: She's not sworn in.

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: That's not a testimony kind of thing. We're just -- we are concerned as a commission that if we fail or somehow our staff fails to give people an opportunity to speak, and we just wanted to make sure that that was -- and nobody had told him he

> UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: No.

MS. M. CARMICHAEL: The gentleman that was speaking, his name was Charles Mitchell.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Okay. What we will do is -- all right, there's a motion that's been

1	made and seconded, any further discussion?
2	MR. A. BIBBS: One more comment.
3	MS. M. CARMICHAEL: What was the motion?
4	COMMISSIONER A. LONG: The motion was to
5	refer back to the Division to follow up on the
6	issues that have been raised today, plus any
7	other witnesses that would
8	COMMISSIONER D. DUMEZICH: And notice
9	and notice up everybody.
10	CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: And we'll notice you
11	guys for additional response once we see what he
12	has to say.
13	COMMISSIONER D. DUMEZICH: Seconded again.
14	CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: Motion's been
15	seconded, any further discussion?
16	(No response.)
17	CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: All those in favor,
18	signify by saying Aye?
19	COMMISSION MEMBERS: Aye.
20	CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: Those opposed, same
21	sign?
22	(No response.)
23	CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I will give you an
24	opportunity for the last comment.
25	MR. A. BIBBS: I'd like to say it's nice to

see everybody come together now, but up until this moment, they stood in every avenue -- in our way of trying to find out the truth, and basically, we just want the truth out there, and now they're trying to pass it to ES&S, but they've been working hand in hand the whole time to fight against this, all this information coming out, and I would just ask you to at least review and go ahead and get to the truth of the matter, and that's what we're asking -- one person, one vote.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I encourage you to hold our feet to the fire, we will have another meeting, we will give you notice, and we'll have an ES&S response, and if they want to come and talk...

COMMISSIONER A. LONG: The responses we get will be public record.

CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: Absolutely. You will get copies of those.

MR. A. BIBBS: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN T. WHEELER: I will accept a motion.

COMMISSIONER D. DUMEZICH: Motion to

adjourn -- seconded. COMMISSIONER A. LONG: Thank you all for coming. CHARIMAN T. WHEELER: Thanks for sitting through that. (At this time the proceedings were adjourned.)

STATE OF INDIANA SS: COUNTY OF HENDRICKS) I, Rhonda J. Hobbs, RPR, and a Notary Public and Stenographic Reporter within and for the County of Hendricks, State of Indiana at large, do hereby certify that on the 1st day of August, 2008, I took down in stenograph notes the foregoing proceedings; That the transcript is a full, true and correct transcript made from my stenograph notes. IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my notarial seal this day of August, 2008. My Commission Expires: Septemer 12, 2009 County of Residence: Hendricks County